10.16.23

LIBRARY OF THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

PRINCETON, N. J.

PRESENTED BY

The Widow of George Dugan, '96

BT 1095 .L59 1892 v.7

Living papers on present day themes

Property of
George Dugan

LIVING PAPERS

SEND FOR A LIST OF CONTENTS FOR ENTIRE SERIES.

A Library of Critical Learning.

LIVING PAPERS ON PRESENT DAY THEMES.

THESE volumes should be in the library of every thoughtful reader.

The set cannot but be desired as soon as their worth is known.

The subjects treated are the leading topics of the day, and the writers are acknowledged authorities on the particular themes discussed.

You can in no other shape add to your library so much valuable material with so small an expenditure.

Note the remarkable list of names included among the contributors.

Principal Cairns,
Rev. C. A. Row,
W. G. Blackie, D.D., LL.D.,
Prebendary Row, M.A.,
Rev. Noah Porter, D.D.,
Canon Rawlinson,
S. R. Pattison, F.G.S.
Dr. Friedrich Pfaff,
Dean of Canterbury,
Henry Wace, D.D.,
Rev. W. F. Wilkinson, M.A.,
James Legge, LL.D.,
Rev. W. G. Elmslie, M.A.,
Dean of Chester,
J. Murray Mitchell, LL.D.,
F. Godet, D.D.,
Eustace P. Conder, M.A., D.D.,
Rev. James Iverach, M.A.,
A. H. Sayce, M.A.,
Rev. J. Radford Thomson, M.A.,
Rev. William Arthur,
Sir W. Muir,
Rev. A. B. Bruce, D.D.,
Alexander Macalister, M.A., M.D.,
Rev. G. F. Maclear, D.D.,
Rev. J. Stoughton, D.D.,
Rev. R. McCheyne Edgar, M.A.,
Rev. John Cairns, D.D.,
Sir J. William Dawson, F.R.S.,
Rev. W. S. Lewis, M.A.,
Rev. John Kelly,
Rev. M. Kaufmann, M.A.,
Canon Girldlestone,
And others.

The above set is put up in a neat box and will be sent, post paid, to any address on receipt of price.

10 Volumes, per set, $10.00.

New York :: FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY :: Chicago

LIVING PAPERS

ON

Present Day Themes

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
OCT 16 1923
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

CHRISTIAN EVIDENCES, DOCTRINES AND MORALS

VOLUME VII.

FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY
NEW YORK | CHICAGO
30 Union Square: East | 148-150 Madison Street
Publishers of Evangelical Literature

PREFACE.

AFTER a break of six months in the issues, a SECOND SERIES of *Present Day Tracts* has been begun. This seventh volume contains the first six numbers. As the new series is intended only to work out more fully the plan laid down in the Preface of the first Volume, the numbering of the separate Tracts runs on. This arrangement will be found practically more convenient to the public and the trade than beginning the numbering again.

Five writers appear as contributors to the Series for the first time,—two of them, eminent scientific laymen, viz., the Cambridge Professor of Anatomy, Dr. Macalister, F.R.S., and the President-Elect of the British Association for the year 1886, Sir J. W. Dawson. Their subjects are of the highest importance, viz., "Man, Physiologically Considered," and "Points of Contact between Revelation and Natural Science." There are now three Tracts in the scientific branch of the Series—the third being "The Age and Origin of Man Geologically Considered," by Mr. Pattison and Professor Pfaff,—and three exclusively devoted to the questions relating to Man, viz., Canon Rawlinson's on "The Antiquity of Man Historically Considered," and the geological and physiological ones above named.

The other new contributors are Dr. Henri Meyer, a French divine, who treats the inexhaustible subject of "The Christ of the Gospels," setting forth in a positive form the argument for His Divine personality and unique human character; Professor Bruce, who expounds and refutes the theory of the Origin of Christianity and the writings of the New Testament propounded by Dr. F. C. Baur, of Tübingen, which still retains its hold of some minds, and exercises its baneful influence in England; and Dr. Maclear, who arrays the vast mass of historical evidence in support of the truth of the New Testament Scriptures. Important additions are thus made to the large branch of the Series relating to Christ and the Christian Scriptures, to which Prebendary Row, Principal Cairns, Professor Elmslie, Principal Wace, and Dean Howson have already made valuable contributions. Professor Radford Thomson makes an important addition—"Utilitarianism, an Illogical and Irreligious Theory of Morals"—to the branch, which includes the prevalent erroneous systems of ethics as well as the non-theistic theories of the world and life. In this branch we have already Tracts on Agnosticism, Materialism, and Pessimism.

Important progress thus has been made in the development of the Series.

The reception which the separate numbers of the Second Series have already met with from the Public and the Press, encourages the hope that the *Present Day Tracts* have entered upon a period of extended usefulness, and are destined to produce still greater results in convincing the unsettled, and confirming the believing readers, than they have yet done. That this hope may be fully realised wlll be the prayer of every follower and friend of Christ.

***January*, 1886.**

CONTENTS.

XXXVII.

THE CHRIST OF THE GOSPELS: A RELIGIOUS STUDY.

By HENRI MEYER, D.D.

XXXVIII.

FERDINAND CHRISTIAN BAUR, AND HIS THEORY OF THE ORIGIN OF CHRISTIANITY AND OF THE NEW TESTAMENT WRITINGS.

By the Rev. A. B. BRUCE, D.D.

XXXIX.

MAN, PHYSIOLOGICALLY CONSIDERED.

By ALEXANDER MACALISTER, M.A., M.D., F.R.S.

XL.

UTILITARIANISM: AN ILLOGICAL AND IRRELIGIOUS THEORY OF MORALS,

By the Rev. J. RADFORD THOMSON, M.A.

XLI.

HISTORICAL ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT SCRIPTURES.

By the Rev. G. F. MACLEAR, D.D.

XLII.

POINTS OF CONTACT BETWEEN REVELATION AND NATURAL SCIENCE.

By Sir J. WILLIAM DAWSON, LL.D., F.R.S., &c., &c.

THE

CHRIST OF THE GOSPELS

BY

HENRI MEYER, D.D.

Argument of the Tract

THE Tract presumes a wide-spread interest in the character and life of Jesus, and proposes to answer the question, Who is He? The answer is to be sought in our four Gospels.

It is shown that Jesus was the ideal man, that He shared our bodily constitution and our sinless mental experiences, yet that He was perfectly free from the sin which has characterised the whole race. His zeal, His wisdom, His courage, His faithfulness, His compassion and tenderness, are illustrated from the Gospels. His sincerity, taken in connection with His declarations concerning Himself, is held to establish His sinlessness not only in action but in heart.

It is then shown that Jesus, according to His own profession, stood in a unique and intimate relation to the Father. Not only His declarations regarding Himself, but His discourses and miracles prove His Divine authority. He was the Son of Man, but He was also the Son of God.

These conclusions are shown to lead up to the final assertion of the Tract, that Jesus is not only the Hebrew Messiah, but the Redeemer of mankind. His sufferings and death are sacrificial in their character. The gift of the Spirit and the growth of the Church are the pledge of His glorious second coming.

The four Gospels are thus shown to concur in setting forth the One Saviour, perfect alike in humanity and Deity.

The Tract concludes by representing the One Divine Saviour, to whom the Gospels bear witness, as the true Friend of man, both in life and in immortality.

THE CHRIST OF THE GOSPELS.[1]

"Then said they unto Him, Who art Thou?"—JOHN viii. 25.

The widespread interest in the question: Who and what is Christ?

NEVER was more interest felt than now in the all-important question, Who and what was Jesus of Nazareth? "What think ye of Christ?" was an inquiry propounded during His earthly ministry; and an inquiry to which various and conflicting answers were given. 'But, as there was only one satisfactory answer given at that time, so is it found to-day that every reply inconsistent with the declarations of Jesus Himself, fails to endure the test of a candid and careful examination. It is characteristic of the time in which we live, that thoughtful persons not only inquire with interest concerning Christ, but that they speak of Him in terms which betoken respect. Even unbelievers acknowledge the claims of our Lord Jesus to their best attention and consideration. There is a widespread conviction among men of intelligence that some reasonable explanation of the facts in which Christianity originated ought to be sought and if possible attained. The problem has tended more and more to centre in the person and the earthly career of Jesus of Nazareth.

---

[1] Abridged from *Le Christ des Évangiles*, Étude Religieuse par H. Meyer, D.D. Paris, 1880. By the Rev. J. Radford Thomson, M.A.

The question cannot be set aside.

The question, What are we to believe concerning Jesus? is then a question not to be neglected or set aside. But where shall we seek the answer? Inquirers have too often given attention chiefly to the teaching of theologians, to the traditions current among Christians, which may be correct, but which may also in some measure be incorrect. And they have too often been influenced, if not determined, in the conclusion to which they have come, by their own imaginations, prepossessions, or prejudices. Now, the proper method upon which it becomes us to seek the true answer to the question proposed, is the method of historical inquiry. We wish to know the facts,—the truth. We should therefore apply ourselves to the study of the Four Gospels, which we have good reason for regarding as containing a credible account of Jesus, based upon the authority of His contemporaries. The words of Jesus Himself, as recorded in these documents, must be deserving of very special consideration.

The answer to this question is to be sought in the Four Gospels.

Especial attention to be given to the words of Jesus regarding Himself.

I.

JESUS THE PERFECT SON OF MAN.

WHAT is the impression concerning the character and mission of Jesus of Nazareth, which the student receives from a careful perusal of the several records of His life? It is noticeable that He habitually spoke of Himself as "the Son of Man." What can we understand from this, but that He was not only partaker of our nature, and "the second Adam," but that He consciously realised the ideal of human nature and life?

Jesus claimed to be the Son of Man, *i.e.*, to realise the ideal of humanity.

How thoroughly our Lord Jesus participated in the lot of humanity! He occupied a lowly station; as He Himself on one occasion declared, He "had not where to lay His head."[1] He was known as a Friend of the poor, and even of the despised.[2] Jesus shared the sinless infirmities of our bodily nature. It is expressly recorded that after the temptation He hungered.[3] At the well of Sychar He thirsted, and asked the Samaritan woman to give Him to drink.[4] On one occasion He was crossing the lake of Galilee in a boat, and, overcome by weariness, He fell asleep in the stern of the vessel, and slept amidst the raging storm that arose, so that He had to be awakened.[5]

He shared our bodily nature and sinless infirmities.

---

[1] Matthew viii. 20. [2] Matthew xi. 19. [3] Matthew iv. 2.
[4] John iv. 6, 7. [5] Mark iv. 38.

He experienced the emotions of which we are susceptible.

Jesus knew also by His own experience the mental emotions which are distinctive of our human nature. He was capable of wonder and astonishment; He marvelled at the unbelief of some among His hearers. Sometimes He was troubled in Spirit.[1] There were occasions when His righteous soul was filled with a holy indignation because of the sinful conduct of the professedly religious.[2] He wept tears of sorrow and sympathy, both in the presence of human calamity and grief,[3] and in the prospect of approaching retribution about to overtake the negligent and irreligious. How Christ's soul was affected by the events and the experience of human life, and by the special trials which He passed through, is manifest from the narratives of the Evangelists. He was no stranger to spiritual conflict, for at the commencement of His ministry He encountered in solitude the assaults of the tempter,[4] and on the eve of His passion He endured the agonies of Gethsemane.[5] The deepest woe of which our nature is capable was transcended by the Saviour's anguish upon the cross, when the bitter cry was wrung from Him, "My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?"[6] There was in Jesus nothing of the stoic's disdain of suffering. He was the "man of sorrows," a true member of this suffering humanity, a brother to all men.

---

[1] John xii. 27; xiii. 21. [2] Matthew xxiii.; Mark iii. 5.
[3] John xi. 35; Matthew xx. 34.
[4] Matthew iv. 1–11; Mark i. 41. [5] Matthew xxvi. 36–46.
[6] Matthew xxvii. 46.

It was in the midst of this life, so truly human, that Jesus realised the moral ideal of humanity.

Yet Jesus was perfectly sinless.

But, whilst He shared our human lot, our human feelings, the Lord Christ had no part in our defects, our errors, our falls. This is abundantly proved by the record of the Evangelists. On one occasion, when challenged by a Pharisee to declare the chief commandment of God, He answered by quoting the Old Testament injunction, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart."[1] This commandment He Himself perfectly obeyed. Intimate indeed was Christ's communion with God. Prayer was the atmosphere He breathed, it was indeed the soul of His life;[2] He even sometimes passed a whole night in prayer.[3] His obedience to the Divine will was filial and perfect; "I seek" said He, "not Mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent Me."[4] It was His daily food to do His Father's will.[5] He could sincerely say, "I love the Father, and as the Father gave Me commandment, even so I do."[6]

His perfect communion with God.

A Being so holy could not but have been often wounded to the heart by the unbelief and sin by

---

[1] Matthew xxii. 37, 38; Mark xii. 29, 30; Luke x. 25–27.

[2] Mark i. 35; Luke iii. 21; v. 16; ix. 18, 29; xxii. 44 John xi. 41, 42; xvii. 9, 20.

[3] Luke vi. 12. [4] John v. 30. [5] John iv. 34. [6] John xiv. 31.

Sensitive to sin in others, He was conscious in Himself of no rebellion against the Father's will.

which He was surrounded. His exclamations of distress because of men's perversity and incredulity have been recorded by His faithful biographers.[1] But it is observable that no rebellious feeling ever arose in His breast, or found utterance from His lips. Submission to the Father's appointments: this was the attitude He maintained all through His ministry.[2] And when that ministry drew to its close, in a manner which called for the utmost fortitude, patience, and resignation, then His submission found utterance in the sublime and pathetic cry, "O My Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass away from Me; nevertheless, not as I will, but as Thou wilt."[3]

His calm dignity and serenity under undeserved ill-treatment.

It must not be supposed that the Son of Man was insensible to suffering. But though sensitive to suffering, He was not overwhelmed by it; on the contrary, when trials and afflictions were most formidable, Jesus was most self-possessed. Thus, when arrested in the garden He secured the safety of His disciples.[4] When before the Jewish council, presided over by Annas, father-in-law of the high-priest, he maintained an attitude of calm even amidst insults and blows.[5] And when at the bar of Pilate, the Roman governor, His dignity of demeanour and of language were such that the judge was troubled in the presence of the Accused. His independence and authority made so deep an impression upon the governor, that he made several efforts to release the guiltless prisoner.[1] Even when on His way to the place of punishment, Jesus thought more of others than Himself: "Weep not for Me," said He to the tender-hearted women among the spectators, "but weep for yourselves and for your children!"[2] We cannot but remark in Him an habitual disposition of perfect submission to the will of His Father. In the midst of unequalled sorrows, He remained master of His heart, His thoughts, His words!

---

[1] Matthew xvii. 17.
[2] Matthew iv. 10; xvi. 22, 23.
[3] Matthew xxvi. 37–42.
[4] John xviii. 1–9.
[5] John xviii. 19–23.

His care for others.

His submission to the Father's will.

Jesus throughout His ministry displayed a singular zeal for the glory of God, a zeal which was manifested by acts of remarkable boldness, such, for instance, as the authoritative cleansing of the temple at Jerusalem. There is moral majesty in the picture which the Evangelists present of the Son of Man expelling the covetous traders from His Father's house.[3] But zealous as Christ was, never did His zeal degenerate into fanaticism. On the contrary, He most carefully avoided any actions which might tend to cut short His career of service by betraying Him into the hands of His foes, before the time arrived appointed by Divine Wisdom for His offering-up.

His zeal for God's glory.

The zeal of Jesus did not lead him into ill-advised haste or fanaticism.

---

[1] John xix. 9–16.

[2] Luke xxiii. 28, 31.

[3] John ii. 16; Matthew xxi. 12, 13.

During the first thirty years of His life, Jesus remained in seclusion and silence. Even after His baptism, He withdrew for forty days into the solitude of the wilderness.[1] So prolonged and serious was the preparation through which our Lord passed with a view to His public ministry.

Jesus's retirement from the metropolis into the country parts of Judæa and thence into Galilee.

The wisdom of the Lord Jesus was manifest in every step He took in fulfilling His public ministry. After a short period of public teaching in Galilee,[2] He repaired to Jerusalem, where He became known as a religious Reformer.[3] But, meeting with opposition, He withdrew into retirement in a rural part of Judæa, where His unobtrusive but Divinely effective ministry secured Him many disciples.[4] It was when the enmity and ill-will of the Pharisees[5] were excited by His success, that He judged it prudent to betake Himself to Galilee, and to make that province—remote as it was from the leaders of the Jewish state—the chief scene of His holy and beneficent labours.[6]

His avoidance of publicity and popularity.

Even in the comparative seclusion of Galilee, Jesus avoided, as far as possible, publicity and fame;[7] and this to such an extent as to excite questionings and misgivings in the mind of John the Baptist, who appears to have expected from the Messiah a more open display of power.[8] On one occasion, when the enthusiasm of the multitude was stirred up, because of His wonderful works, and when they would fain have made Him king, Jesus at once checked the manifestation by withdrawing from His admirers, and retiring to the mountain solitudes.[1] He even forbade His disciples as yet to tell any one that He was Christ, lest the excitement of the people should be renewed.[2] A remarkable instance of the wisdom of Jesus is recorded by the Evangelist John, who tells us that, upon the occasion of the Feast of Tabernacles, the brethren of Jesus were very anxious that He should go up to the metropolis, and before the assembled thousands declare Himself to be the Messiah; but who records also that Jesus declined to accede to their request, since He knew that His hour was not yet come.[3] When, however, His time approached, He acted otherwise. The enthusiasm of the Galileans seems to have cooled when they found that He was not likely to realize their hopes of a political Messiah.[4] Jesus went up to Jerusalem, and there fulfilled His latest, most solemn, and most powerful ministry. He still evaded the malicious efforts of His foes to entrap and capture Him.[5] And it was only when His active ministry was all but finished, and when the period of humi-

---

[1] Matthew iv. 1, 2; Mark i. 13; Luke iv. 1, 2.

[2] John i. 44; ii. 12.

[3] John ii. 18–20.

[4] John iii. 22.

[5] John iv. 1, 2.

[6] John iv. 3, 43–46, 54.

[7] Matthew viii. 4.

[8] Matthew xi. 6.

His wisdom apparent both in His general seclusion, and in His declaration of His royalty in due time.

---

[1] John vi. 14, 15.

[2] Matthew xvi. 20; Mark viii. 30; Luke ix. 21.

[3] John vii. 6–8.

[4] John vi. 66.

[5] Matthew xix. 3–9; xxii. 15–46.

liation and suffering was felt by Him to be at hand, that Jesus publicly accepted the homage of the people, and in the triumphal entry consented to receive the honours and the designations which were His rightful due.[1]

The discrimination and practical wisdom shown by Jesus in dealing with men.

The wisdom and discretion of Jesus are apparent in the manner in which He dealt with the different classes of persons with whom He came into contact, and especially in the manner in which He adapted His instructions to the varying character and needs of His hearers. His insight penetrated every mind, and He knew well by what means to subdue the souls of men, and bring them into the spiritual kingdom of God. He ever attacked with boldness the pride, the illusions, the worldly attachments, which He detected in those with whom He conversed. What illustrations of this marvellous insight and fidelity have we in Christ's recorded conversations with Nicodemus,[2] and again with the rich young ruler who aspired to the eternal life![3] He could speak faithfully, almost sternly, as, for example, when He commanded that the dead should be left to bury their dead;[4] but He could speak also with condescension and gentleness to those who needed instruction and encouragement. The interview with the woman of Samaria is a marvellous instance of the way in which Jesus would deal

He adapted Himself to persons of every character and condition.

---

[1] John xii. 12–19. [2] John iii. 3. [3] Matthew xix. 21.
[4] Luke ix. 60.

with an intelligent and candid, but at the same time ignorant and sinful nature.[1] No wonder that she was prompted to inquire: "Is not this the Christ?"

The profundity and variety of our Lord's teaching.

Jesus has been termed "The Great Teacher"; and however inadequate such a designation may be, its justice is unquestionable. Original, striking, and varied were the forms in which He presented truth to the minds of men. Sometimes He expanded His thoughts in eloquent discourses, as in the Sermon on the Mount.[2] Sometimes He condensed His thoughts into terse and even paradoxical sentences.[3] Sometimes His teaching took the shape of an enigma;[4] more often that of a parable.[5] He drew His illustrations from the scenes of nature,[6] from the incidents of daily life,[7] from the records of the Old Testament.[8] He so expressed His Divine thoughts that they could not be forgotten; and as a matter of fact many of these precious utterances have been put upon record by His disciples, and have enriched all subsequent generations with their priceless spiritual wealth.

The discreetness and circumspection of the Lord

---

[1] John iv. 1–30

[2] Matthew v.–vii.

[3] Matthew vi. 24; xix. 24, 30; xxii. 14.

[4] Matthew xiii. 12; xxiv. 28; Luke vi. 33-36; John iii. 14.

[5] Matthew xiii. 1–50; xxii. 1–14; xxv.; Luke x. 30–37; xv.; John x. 1–5.

[6] Matthew vi. 25-32; xiii. 1-9; Luke xii. 54-57; John iv. 35-38.

[7] Matthew ix. 14–17; xi. 16–19; xx. 1-16; Mark i. 17.

[8] Matthew xii. 3–5; Luke iv. 24-30; John vi. 26-58.

The discreetness with which Jesus eluded snares laid for Him.

Jesus were signally manifested in the manner in which He eluded the snares which were laid for Him by His crafty foes. In answering the captious questions, by which they sought to entrap Him, He always found an opportunity of bringing into prominence some great and fruitful truth. Thus when they sought either to imperil His influence over the Jews, or to bring Him into disfavour with the Roman authorities, by their famous question as to the lawfulness of paying tribute, Jesus not only avoided the snare, but in His reply laid down a great practical principle for the guidance of His followers in all time.[1] And when the Sadducees plied Him with their foolish question concerning the woman who married seven brothers in succession, and thus endeavoured to discredit the doctrine of the Resurrection, Jesus answered them in language which is enshrined in the heart of Christendom :—"God is not the God of the dead, but of the living : for all live unto Him."[2]

Christ's courage and fearlessness.

There was no weakness in the wise and careful circumspection of the Lord Jesus. He never yielded to the impulse of the prejudices or passions which in His circumstances would have mastered others. Nor did He ever yield to timidity. His fearlessness was evident in His return to Judæa upon receiving tidings of Lazarus' illness. He knew the danger involved in visiting Bethany ; but this did not deter Him from carrying out His purposes of mercy.[1] The question with Him was not, Is the path difficult or perilous? but, Is it the path of duty, the path of obedience to God?

---

[1] Matthew xxii. 15–22.

[2] Luke xx. 34–38.

His truthfulness and frankness.

With the wisdom of the serpent, Jesus would have His disciples conjoin the harmlessness and simplicity of the dove.[2] On many occasions He commended—what He ever exemplified—transparency and truthfulness of character and speech.[3] When He Himself endured pain and grief, He did not dissimulate.[4] Even in the agony of Gethsemane, Jesus sought with beautiful frankness the solace of His disciples' sympathy.[5] There was in Him no affectation; what He was, that He appeared to be.

His sincerity and faithfulness.

Discreet as was Christ's conduct, He acted with a vigorous sincerity. Wherever He saw sin, He stigmatized and rebuked it with inexorable frankness; nor did He shrink from threatening hardened and impenitent sinners with the doom of "outer darkness."[6] Hypocrisy was, of all sins, that which Jesus most hated; never has stronger, more trenchant language come from human lips than the language in which He denounced the hollow formality, the unspiritual ceremonialism of the

---

[1] John xi. 6–10.
[2] Matthew x. 16.
[3] Luke xviii. 17; Matthew xi. 25; v. 37.
[4] John xi. 33–35; xii. 27; xiii. 21.
[5] Matthew xxvi. 38.
[6] Matthew vii. 13; viii. 12; xxii. 13; xxv. 30.

Scribes and Pharisees of His day.[1] And most faithful and earnest were His warnings against a religion consisting in words and in attitudes, and lacking in sincerity and genuine godliness.[2]

His charity and compassion.

With severity in condemning sin, Jesus conjoined the tenderest charity for men. While He opposed Himself to moral evil in every form, He did this out of pity for the sinful race whose nature He had deigned to assume. The love which was pre-eminent in the Son of Man, thrills even in some of the severest of His words. How marvellously is this combination apparent in the language in which Jesus mourned over the sin, the impenitence, and the approaching doom of the highly-favoured but unfaithful city which was on the point of rejecting Him! "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killeth the prophets, and stoneth them that are sent unto her; how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not!"[3]

His tenderness towards the young.

In fact, Jesus loved all mankind, and He not only loved the race, He loved every particular human being. He cared for little children, and even identified Himself with them;—to receive a little child in His name was to receive Himself.[4] When He folded the babes in His arms, He took occasion to enjoin upon all men childlikeness of character, as the indispensable condition of entrance into His spiritual kingdom.[1] The poor were objects of His gracious notice and affection. The touching incident of "the widow's mite" illustrates His consideration for the lowly and indigent.[2] The afflicted, the humble, the oppressed were regarded by Jesus with peculiar kindness and commiseration.[3] Nor did He disclaim the sinful, the debased, the despised; such, when they evinced contrition and true penitence, were welcomed to His society, and heard from His gracious lips words of forgiveness and of encouragement. "I," said the Divine Physician of souls, "I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance."[4] In accordance with His language was His conduct. When He pardoned the sinful woman who came to Him as He sat at meat in the house of Simon;[5] when He became the guest of Zacchæus, the chief of the publicans;[6] on such occasions He proved His compassion for those whom religious formalists were too ready to despise. And yet at the very time that He showed mercy to the sinner, Jesus censured and condemned the sin. No more notable case of this kind is recorded than that of the woman taken in adultery, to whom the Holy Saviour addressed

---

[1] Matthew xxiii. 23–28.

[2] Matthew vi. 1–6, 16–18.

[3] Matthew xxiii. 37, 38; Luke xiii. 34, 35.

[4] Matthew xviii. 5.

His gentleness towards the poor and the despised.

---

[1] Luke xviii. 16, 17.
[2] Luke xxi. 3, 4.
[3] Matthew xv. 21–28; John iv. 47–50; ix. 6, 7.
[4] Mark ii. 17; Matthew ix. 12, 13; Luke v. 31, 32.
[5] Luke vii. 36–50.
[6] Luke xix. 4–10.

those memorable words: "Neither do I condemn thee; go, and sin no more."[1]

Christ's indignant denunciation of mere ceremonialism in religion.

Whilst He laid stress upon the religion of the heart, and upon the great duties of morality, our Lord treated with contempt those rigid precepts, those ceremonial requirements which were too often in His time, as indeed in all times, substituted for genuine piety and goodness.[2] The Jewish restrictions which had gathered round the Sabbath, were shown by Him to be inconsistent with the true spirit of the fourth commandment, and accordingly with that Christian liberty which Jesus instituted in His Church.[3] He pitied those who were taught by the Pharisees to aim at working out a religious position, a meritorious righteousness, by laborious efforts to attain a standard of ritual, ceremonial perfection, and He compassionately invited all such to take in preference His mild yoke, and to bear His easy burden, that so doing they might find rest unto their souls.[4]

The friendship cherished by Jesus for the Twelve.

Towards the chosen Twelve, Jesus cherished feelings of warm friendship, which were not chilled by their many errors and imperfections. He even on a very solemn occasion washed their feet, in order to impart to them more effectively than by words, the supreme lesson of humility.[5]

---

[1] John viii. 6–11.

[2] Matthew xxiii. 13; Mark vii. 15, 21–23.

[3] Matthew xii. 1–8; Mark ii. 23–28; Luke vi. 1–5.

[4] Matthew xi. 28–30.

[5] John xiii. 1–17.

His tender heart was pained by the thought, that one of his own companions and disciples would betray Him to His foes.[1] We are able to judge of His feelings towards the Twelve, from His last quiet, consolatory, and encouraging discourse, which has been recorded by John with unusual fulness, and which gives us a delightful insight into the sympathy and kindness which possessed the Master's soul, and animated His intercourse with His beloved ones.[2] And His High Priestly prayer proves how deep was His concern for the true welfare of these chosen few, for their preservation and their moral perfection.[3]

Jesus realises in his character and life the moral ideal of humanity.

Such a review as that now taken of the earthly life and ministry of Jesus of Nazareth, leads to the conclusion that *in Him the moral ideal of humanity was realised.* As far as the records enable us to judge, we must pronounce Him the perfect man: perfect in purity, in wisdom, in moral energy in sympathy, benevolence, and love to man.

Was Jesus as pure in heart as in life?

But an objection may be urged, which deserves our consideration. The Gospels—say the unbelievers—do not relate all that passed in the inmost heart of Jesus; and we have no right to presume that throughout His life, Jesus was free from every taint and stain of sin. This specious objection, however, admits of a conclusive answer.

All that we know of Jesus, of His upright

---

[1] John vi. 71; xv. 16. [2] John xv. 12–15. [3] John xvii.

We accept His own witness upon this as true.

character, His perfect insight, constrains us to believe that He knew Himself, that He is a credible witness to His own moral standing. Now Jesus of Nazareth deemed Himself absolutely free from sin.

Jesus alone of all men was without consciousness of sin.

Whilst all other servants of God, before and after Christ, have without exception humbled themselves before God on account of their trangressions of the Divine law,[1] not one word is recorded to have escaped the lips of Jesus, expressive of any consciousness of sin, of any regret for fault committed, for duty neglected. He required repentance and conversion from others, but He felt no necessity on His own part for such experiences.[2] He continually warned His auditors—even His personal followers—of the possibility of final condemnation and rejection from the kingdom of God.[3] But so far was He from imagining the possibility of His own exclusion from that kingdom, that He always represented Himself as possessing the power of admission and of rejection. Concerning the fate of hypocrites, He said: "Then will I profess unto them, I never knew you; depart from Me, ye that work iniquity."[4]

Again and again in the Gospels recurs this contrast between sinful men and the sinless Son of

---

[1] Psalm li.; Romans vii. 14–25; 1 Timothy i. 15; James iii. 2; 1 John i. 8–10.

[2] Matthew iv. 17; Mark i. 15; Luke xiii. 1–5.

[3] Matthew v. 20; x. 28; xviii. 35.

[4] Matthew vii. 21–23.

The contrast between the sinfulness of mankind generally and the sinlessness of Christ.

Man. His disciples were taught to put up a daily prayer for pardon;[1] He claimed for Himself the right to forgive sins.[2] He reminded His hearers of their sinfulness in God's sight; but affirmed that He did always those things that pleased God.[3] "For righteousness' sake," and "For My sake," were, with Christ, equivalent and convertible expressions.[4] He came to fulfil the law, which no sinful man had done, or could do.[5] He claimed faultlessness in the sight of His Father: "I do always the things that are pleasing to Him."[6] He boldly appealed even to His enemies, "Which of you convinceth Me of sin?"[7] Who but Jesus could have taken a stand like this? He was indeed hated, but it was "without cause."[8] In the interview with the rich young ruler Jesus implicitly accepted as His due the title by which He was addressed—though with an insufficient understanding of its import—when He was called, "Good Master."[9] Could He have claimed, as He did, the first place in His disciples' hearts, had He not been conscious of that perfect sinlessness, which alone could give Him a just right to a position quite unique?

The justice of our Lord's claim to freedom from sin.

But Jesus actually and explicitly asserted His moral perfection, and presented Himself to His

---

[1] Luke xi. 4.
[2] Matthew ix. 6; Mark ii. 10; Luke v. 24.
[3] John viii. 29.
[4] Matthew v. 10, 11.
[5] Matthew v. 17.
[6] John viii. 29.
[7] John viii. 46.
[8] John xv. 25.
[9] Mark x. 18.

He presented Himself as a perfect model for the imitation of His disciples.

disciples as the faultless model for their imitation. Who but Jesus could have ventured to address to others language such as this?—"If ye keep My commandments ye shall abide in My love; even as I have kept My Father's commandments, and abide in His love."[1]

Jesus always taught His disciples that it would be enough for them to resemble their Master;[2] teaching which implied the perfection of His character and life. He placed perfection in moral similarity to the Father;[3] and this perfection He claimed Himself to have attained.

In this He neither deceived Himself nor others.

Now no reasonable person will maintain that Jesus of Nazareth was an impostor, who, knowing Himself to be faulty and imperfect, deliberately deceived His disciples by representing Himself to be without sin. And it is as incredible that He should Himself have been under an illusion as to His own moral excellence.

It is impossible that the Wisest of beings, the Light of all ages, should be so mistaken regarding Himself; that Jesus should have had perfect intelligence of moral truth, and should yet have deceived Himself as to His own character; that He should have, like ourselves, carried evil with Him in His heart, and yet should never have discerned it, and should have formed a judgment of Himself entirely false and unjust.

---

[1] John xv. 10. [2] Matthew x. 25; John xiii. 16. [3] Matthew v. 48.

Certainly we do not know all that passed in the mind of the Lord Jesus; this is not possible to us. But this we do know, that He was perfectly aware of His own moral character and life, and that we are justified in believing His declaration that He was free from sin and perfect in holiness, that no sin ever soiled His heart, and that He alone, in the midst of our fallen humanity, was the one normal, ideal, and perfect man.[1]

We are justified in accepting His witness to His perfect goodness

II.

Jesus the Son of God.

We have hitherto been considering the human side of Jesus' character and life. He was the sinless Son of Man. We have now to show that between Jesus and God there existed a relation altogether unique.

Jesus was more than the sinless Son of Man

When a boy of twelve years old, Jesus used most remarkable language in explaining to His parents His detention in the Temple at Jerusalem: "Wist ye not that I must be about My Father's business?"[2] This language anticipated that of His future Ministry; it was as His Father that Jesus ever spoke of God.[3] On many occasions, as we learn from the record of the New Testament,

---

[1] John vi. 68, 69; John vii. 18.

[2] Luke ii. 49.

[3] Matthew vii. 21; xii. 50; xviii. 35; xxvi. 53; John ii. 16; v. 17; x. 29.

Jesus was conscious of a special relation to the Father.

He expressed His consciousness of the most intimate relation with the Eternal. "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work." "What things soever the Father doeth, these the Son also doeth in like manner." "The Father loveth the Son."[1] Such passages are sufficient evidence of the terms upon which Jesus conceived Himself to stand towards the Father. When Simon Peter acknowledged Him to be "the Christ, the Son of the Living God,"[2] his confession was accepted and approved. And before Caiaphas Jesus made no secret of His unique relation to the Lord of all.[3]

Many utterances of our Lord imply and many declare His Deity.

We meet—not only in John's Gospel, but in the other Gospels also—with proofs of our Lord's assumption of Divine dignity. Thus Matthew and Luke have recorded this sublime and conclusive utterance which came from Jesus' lips: "All things have been delivered unto Me of My Father; and no one knoweth the Son save the Father: neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal Him."[4] There was a holy familiarity in the manner in which Jesus spoke of God, which was becoming in Him, but which would not have been becoming in any other. These are instances:— "I and My Father are one;[5] "The Father is greater than I;"[1] "If a man love Me, he will keep My word, and My Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him."[2] It was such expressions as these which suggested the profound remark of Pascal, "that Jesus spoke so simply of the greatest things, and even of Divine things, that we feel that He must have been familiar and at home with them."

---

[1] John v. 17, 19, 20.
[2] Matthew xvi. 13–17.
[3] Matthew xxv. 62–64.
[4] Matthew xi. 25–27; Luke x. 21, 22.
[5] John x. 30

He spoke of a state of divine dignity preceding His Incarnation.

It must further be observed that this filial relation towards God, of which Jesus was conscious, did not begin in this earthly life. Again and again, He affirmed that heaven was His proper and native country.[3] He knew whence He came and whither He went.[4] There was One who had sent Him whom the Jews knew not.[5] The Father had sanctified Him, and had sent Him into the world.[6] He came from the Father, and to the Father He returned.[7] In reply to some who were offended with Him for saying that He was "the bread which came down from heaven," Jesus asked them, "What if ye should behold the Son of Man ascending where He was before?"[8]

Several instances of Christ's claims to Divine attributes are recorded by St. John.

In the conversation with the Jews recorded by John, in the eighth chapter of his Gospel, our Lord claimed the very highest dignity and power. He promised those who kept His word that they should never see death. He declared that the Father glorified Him. He astonished and enraged His hearers by assuring them, "Before Abraham was, I am."[1] Such language was a direct affirmation of His pre-existence, and it harmonises with the language He subsequently employed in His Intercessory Prayer: "And now, O Father, glorify Thou Me with Thine own self with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was."[2] "Thou lovedst Me before the foundation of the world."[3] Thus, even whilst Jesus assumed the form of a servant, there shone through His lowly guise some glimpses of His native majesty.

---

[1] John xiv. 28.
[2] John xiv. 23.
[3] John iii. 13; vi. 33, 50, 51.
[4] John viii. 14.
[5] John vii. 28, 29.
[6] John x. 36.
[7] John xvi. 28.
[8] John vi. 62.

Christ's Divinity apparent not only from His words, but from His miracles.

This Divine glory was apparent, not only in the words He uttered, but in the many and various miracles, the record of which occupies so many of the pages of the Four Gospels. When He stilled the storm upon the Lake of Genesareth, such was the impression made by this exhibition of authority —even upon the twelve who knew Him well—that they exclaimed in astonishment: "What manner of man is this, that even the winds and the sea obey Him?"[4] But if the impression produced by this miracle is recorded, we cannot doubt that a similar impression was produced by other instances of the exercise of supernatural power by the Prophet of Nazareth. When the people saw Him feed thousands with a few loaves of bread;[1] when they witnessed the healing of various diseases and infirmities,[2] and especially the cure of demoniacs;[3] when lepers were cleansed, and paralytics restored to the use of their bodily powers,—how could they avoid the conclusion that marvellous power was entrusted to this beneficent Teacher and Physician! Jesus raised from the funeral bier the son of a widow of Nain: what was the effect produced by the miracle? "Fear took hold on all, and they glorified God, saying, A great Prophet is arisen among us; and God hath visited His people."[4] A similar conviction was wrought by the miraculous raising from the bed of death of the youthful daughter of the ruler Jairus.[5] But of all Christ's miracles the most stupendous in itself, and the most powerful in the impression it produced both upon friends and foes, was the resurrection of Lazarus of Bethany.[6] This sign was expressly wrought in order that the people might see the glory of God, and might know that the Father ever heard Him, and indeed that the Father had sent Him into the world.

---

[1] John viii. 51–58.

[2] John xvii. 4, 5.

[3] John xvii. 24.

[4] Matthew viii. 27.

The impression wrought by these "signs and wonders" upon spectators.

In fact all the miracles related in the Gospels are so many revelations of the glory of the Son of

---

[1] John vi. 1–13.

[2] Matthew iv. 23; viii. 1–4; ix. 35; Luke xvii. 11–19; John v. 1–16, etc.

[3] Mark i. 23–28; v. 1–20.

[4] Luke vii. 13–16.

[5] Mark v. 37–43.

[6] John xi. 33–44.

Man, and so many evidences of a greatness unique and truly Divine.[1] Jesus Himself was accustomed to appeal to His miracles as evidences of His Divinity. It was to these He pointed, when the messengers of the forerunner came to Him with the question, "Art Thou He that should come?"[2] It was for their disregard of these, that He so severely denounced the unbelief of the inhabitants of Chorazin and Bethsaida.[3] It was upon these that, in controversy with the unbelieving Jews, He staked His claims: "If I do not the works of My Father, believe Me not!"[4] And at the very close of His ministry, Jesus gave final judgment against those who rejected Him, saying: "If I had not done among them the works which none other did, they had not had sin; but now have they both seen and hated both Me and My Father."[5]

Jesus appealed to His deeds as evidence of His Divine authority.

As the works of the Son of Man are the manifestation of a Divine power, so His *word* is the very Word of God. The people listening to His discourses felt that, "He spake as one having authority, and not as the scribes."[6] The officers sent to apprehend Him acknowledged that "never man spake like this man."[7] He Himself was conscious that His words were imperishable, "Heaven and earth," said He, "shall pass away, but My

This Divine authority was felt in His public discourses.

---

[1] John ii. 11.
[2] Matthew xi. 2-6.
[3] Matthew xi. 21-24.
[4] John x. 37, 38.
[5] John xv. 23-25.
[6] Matthew vii. 28, 29.
[7] John vii. 46.

words shall not pass away."[1] He knew that His word was indestructible seed which should from age to age produce a spiritual harvest to the praise of God.[2]

Jesus the Divine Deliverer of men from error, sin, and spiritual death.

In fact, the word of the lowly carpenter of Nazareth had virtue to deliver man from the worst ills to which he was subject—from error, sin, and death. To receive that word in reverent faith, was and is to attain spiritual liberty and eternal life.[3]

The Father is revealed in the Son.

Christ was the revelation of the Father to mankind. His judgment,—He Himself declared,—was the Father's judgment;[4] His will was the Father's will.[5] The compassion of the Son of Man, His holy love, His pity towards the penitent, His condescension towards the young, His anxiety for the welfare and salvation of all—this is the same love as that of the Father in heaven, whose desire it is that not one of His offspring should perish.[6] In the Son of Man are revealed the Father's wisdom and holiness, power and charity. He who has seen the Son has seen the Father.[7]

Those who have spiritual discernment recognize God as in Christ.

Christ is the living Revelation of God. His person is the centre of the religious life of men—the object of their faith. He ever represented Himself as the authoritative bestower of the highest blessings: "You believe in God, believe also in

---

[1] Matthew xxiv. 35.
[2] Matthew xiii. 1–23.
[3] John v. 24, 25; viii. 51.
[4] John viii. 16.
[5] John v. 30.
[6] Matthew xviii. 14.
[7] John xiv. 9.

ME."[1] "*I* will give you rest."[2] To love the Son of Man, is to love God; to hate Him, is to hate God.[3] To give oneself to Him, is to give oneself to God;[4] to hold fellowship with Him, is to hold fellowship with God;[5] to dwell in Him, is to dwell in God.[6] The Son of Man is God become man; is (as Vinet says), "the God whom one sees and loves,"—is (as Pascal declares), "the God whose knees one can embrace!"

The unreasonableness of any lower view of Christ's person and character.

It is not incredible that our Father in heaven should manifest Himself to us in the person of His Son. But it is incredible that a Being so morally unique as Jesus, a Being who has been and is the source of the highest spiritual blessings to mankind, should have lived and died under an illusion as to His relation to the heavenly Father, that He should have been in error in claiming to be the very Son of God. We reason from His faultless, glorious character, to the validity of His own witness to Himself, to His proper Deity. The Son of Man He was,—meek and lowly in heart; but He was also, what from the beginning to the end of His ministry on earth, He consistently claimed to be and proved Himself to be,—THE SON OF GOD!

---

[1] John xiv. 1.
[2] Matthew xi. 28.
[3] John xv. 23.
[4] John xvii. 10.
[5] John xvii. 23.
[6] John xiv. 23.

III.

JESUS THE SAVIOUR OF THE WORLD.

Jesus was the Messiah foretold in Hebrew prophecy.

JESUS, the Son of Man, was undoubtedly the Messiah, foretold by the Hebrew prophets. But His mission was far grander and loftier than any local or national office could involve. He Himself spoke of other sheep than those of the fold of Israel, whom He destined to form the one flock under His care; for He was the Divine Shepherd of mankind.[1] His life, His miracles, His teaching, His obedience to the Father's will, His conflict with the world's sin—all converged towards one and the same end, THE REDEMPTION OF MANKIND. And that which rendered Him the Saviour was *the giving up of His life as a ransom for many.*

But He was the Saviour not of Israel only but of mankind.

From the very commencement of His ministry—as we learn from the recorded conversation with Nicodemus—Jesus contemplated its tragical end. He foretold that He should be "lifted up from the earth."[2] And, as the time drew near, He gave His disciples to understand that He should "suffer many things at the hands of the chief priests and scribes," that He should be put to the death with violence, and that He should rise again on the third day.[3] The prospect was one which troubled

During His ministry our Lord looked forward to suffering and death.

---

[1] John x. 16. [2] John iii. 14, 15.

[3] Matthew xvi. 21; xvii. 22, 23; xx. 17–19; xxvi. 2.

His sensitive spirit; He looked forward to an overwhelming baptism of suffering.[1] Yet He regarded His approaching anguish as appointed by Divine wisdom, and as foretold in Old Testament Scripture. He was the grain of wheat which must die in order to bring forth much fruit;[2] His flesh was the bread which He would give for the life of the world.[3] On the eve of His passion, when instituting the Memorial Supper, He spoke of His blood as "My blood of the covenant, which is shed for many unto remission of sins."[4]

The unique character of Christ's sufferings

In the mortal sufferings of the Lord Jesus there was something more than appeared upon the surface. Whilst many of Christ's courageous followers have died the martyr's death with cheerfulness, and even with gladness, it is observable that His was no triumphant end. His death was preceded by unutterable agony of spirit. Although he had always expressed His conviction that the Father would not leave Him to Himself,[5] in "the hour of the power of darkness,"[6] He felt Himself forsaken by His heavenly Father.[7] Deep was the humiliation into which He descended for our sake, and bitter was the cup of woe He deigned to drink for us!

The explanation of Christ's anguish is to be found in the consideration that it had reference to the inviolable moral law of the great Ruler of the universe. The righteous Governor could not suffer His law to be defied and contemned, He could not absolve the guilty race of men, without exhibiting the authority and majesty of the law connecting punishment with sin. Jesus, the only innocent member of our race, submitting to unmerited sufferings and death, made a reparation for human sin. Thus, every guilty soul that repents, confides in the Redeemer, and takes advantage of the propitiation He has offered, is assured by the Gospel of obtaining in Jesus' name and for Jesus' sake, the pardon of His trangressions, salvation, and eternal life.[1] Christ's death was a willing sacrifice, an act of cheerful obedience towards His Father, of ready devotion for the salvation of His brothers of mankind; He "tasted death for every man." He might have avoided death, but, as the Good Shepherd, He chose to give His life for the sheep.[2]

---

[1] Luke xii. 50.
[2] John xii. 24.
[3] John vi. 51–53.
[4] Matthew xxvi. 26–28.
[5] John viii. 16, 29.
[6] Luke xxii. 53.
[7] Matthew xxvii. 46.

Only to be explained by their sacrificial and atoning import.

In reading the narrative of our Lord's passion, as given by the Evangelists, we are constrained to regard it, not as the defeat of one vanquished by the might of His adversaries, but as the consummation of the career of humiliation voluntarily accepted by the Saviour of mankind. In the midst of His ignominy, His holiness and His

---

[1] Matthew xxvi. 28; xx. 28; John iii. 14, 15.

[2] John x. 14, 15.

The moral sublimity and beauty evident in Christ's demeanour on the cross.

Divinity shone forth with all the more majestic splendour. Witness the several incidents recorded by those who witnessed the awful scene on Calvary; —His prayer for His executioners,[1] His commendation of His mother to the care of John,[2] His gracious promise of salvation to the dying malefactor.[3] Even to His last breath He retained His self-possession, and displayed His patience, His filial solicitude, His compassion, His Divine majesty. And when He had yielded His spirit unto His Father's hands, His demeanour, taken in connection with the earthquake, the darkness, and all the accompanying circumstances, elicited from the Roman centurion the exclamation: "Surely this was a righteous man.[4] Truly this was the Son of God!"[5]

Christ's Resurrection was in fulfilment of His own predictions.

The narrative of Christ's earthly manifestation does not, however, end with His death. When, during His ministry He spoke of His approaching decease, He professed His intention of taking again the life He was about to lay down.[6] Accordingly, we find the Evangelists relate that, on the third day after His death, Jesus showed Himself, risen and living, to His disciples, and that He offered most indisputable proofs of the reality of His resurrection, showing them His wounds,[7] and bidding them handle Him, eating[1] and conversing with them, and displaying for their benefit His miraculous power over nature.[2]

---

[1] Luke xxxiii. 34. [2] John xix. 25–27. [3] Luke xxiii. 43.
[4] Luke xxiii. 47. [5] Matthew xxvii. 54. [6] John x. 17, 18.
[7] Luke xxiv. 39; John xx. 20.

The authority and tenderness combined in the language of the Risen Saviour.

The words of the risen Jesus have in no respect the character of apocryphal, invented sayings. They are all worthy of the Divine Speaker. Such is the case with the message He sent by Mary to His brethren, "I ascend unto My Father and your Father, to My God and your God;"[3] with the authoritative language in which He conferred the gift of the Spirit upon His assembled disciples;[4] with the appeal and the subsequent declaration upon the occasion of the interview with Thomas;[5] with the instructions delivered to the Apostles with reference to their evangelistic mission to their fellow men.[6] Nothing is more decisive upon this point, than the record of the conversation which took place between the risen Lord and Simon Peter.[7] The faithfulness and tenderness breathing throughout the recorded words of the Saviour, are conclusive evidence that they were *His* words in whose heart was no indifference to sin, but also no harshness towards the repentant sinner. In fact such an interview as that related by John in the 21st chapter of his Gospel could not possibly have been invented.

---

[1] Luke xxiv. 41–43. [2] John xx. 1–14. [3] John xx. 17.
[4] John xx. 22, 23. [5] John xx. 26–29.
[6] Matthew xxviii. 18–20. [7] John xxi. 15–23.

The Resurrection confirms our Lord's own representations of Himself as Saviour and Lord of man.

The resurrection of the Lord Jesus was the confirmation of His own witness to Himself. It *is* the seal placed by the hand of the Almighty God upon the person and work of Jesus, to assure us that, in the transaction of Calvary, sin and death, those two tyrants of our afflicted humanity, were conquered by Jesus Christ, and that He who has obtained this victory is—not only in virtue of His dignity as Son of God, but also as the great Redeemer — the sovereign Shepherd, and the glorious, gracious King of man.

Christ's Ascension.

Withdrawn from human sight, Jesus lives in heavenly places. At the right hand of God[1] He pleads with His Father for mankind, and reveals Himself in a manner altogether invisible and spiritual, but yet real and effective, to all who trust in Him and love Him.

The gift of the Spirit.

On the eve of His death Jesus promised the great gift of the Holy Spirit, the Comforter,[2] and this promise He has, through the long ages that have since elapsed, been fulfilling for the benefit of all His disciples, conferring thus upon them the blessings of truth and holiness, guidance, peace, and consolation. He foretold that men should witness the signs of His spiritual power in the establishment of His kingdom, both in the heart of individuals, and in the bosom of human society. His prediction is still in course of fulfilment.

---

[1] Mark xvi. 19. [2] John xiv. 16–19; xvi. 7, 13, 14–16.

The Church of the Redeemer grows like a tree—mighty and spreading.[1] The circle which includes the believing and obedient, is constantly widening, as the Gospel is preached in the most distant lands.[2]

The growth of the spiritual kingdom.

When the purpose of Divine wisdom is accomplished, then the end shall come. The Son of Man shall appear in His glory, the dead shall be raised, the righteous shall be separated from the wicked. And whilst the workers of iniquity shall be rejected, the elect shall be gathered into the heavenly kingdom,[3] and, freed for ever from sin, from sorrow, and from death, shall enter into the full enjoyment of all that their Lord has promised,—shall share in the beatific and eternal vision of their God!

The expected Second Coming.

In picturing the moral lineaments of Jesus, we have combined the representations given by those who are called the Synoptic Evangelists—Matthew, Mark, and Luke, with the very distinct, and yet perfectly consistent and harmonious representation of the Fourth Gospel. We have recognized, in the several delineations of the Evangelists, ONE DIVINE ORIGINAL,—a Being who was conscious of possessing perfect holiness and Divine dignity, and of having come to earth, commissioned by His Father, to achieve the redemption of mankind.

The Gospels concur to present to our view One Divine Original.

---

[1] Matthew xiii. 31, 32. [2] Matthew xxiv. 14.

[3] Matthew xxv. 31–46; John v. 28, 29; Matthew xiii. 43.

We have seen Christ's own declarations blend into a single testimony in favour of the Divinity of the Son of Man, in whom the weary and the heavy-laden recognize the Saviour whom they seek,—a Saviour who, though belonging to humanity, is yet infinitely above humanity, so that, without being guilty of idolatry, we can base our faith upon Him, and to Him can yield our heart.

The several Gospels have their peculiarities,

That there are divergencies in detail between the first three Gospels and that of John, is admitted. The aim of the Synoptists was to preserve the primitive accounts received by Christians as to the facts of our Saviour's ministry;[1] the aim of John was to prove that Jesus of Nazareth was none other than the Divine Word taking upon Him the nature, and living the life, of man.[2] The four Evangelists have concurred in bringing before our minds THE ONE CHRIST, with the witness He Himself bore to His absolute moral perfection, His Divine dignity, His redemptive mission. These historians have preserved for our benefit the testimony of Jesus to His own nature, character, and work. They have not "invented" Jesus Christ, but they have permitted us to hear His discourses, to witness His mighty works, to follow Him to His cross, to behold His glory.

But the Christ they depict is one and the same.

Jesus Christ really was what He professed to be. His witness to Himself is the perfect Truth

---

[1] Luke i. 1-4.

[2] John i. 1-18.

—a rock upon which those who would have certainty and safety may confidently build.[1]

Christ is our true Friend in life.

To be happy in the midst of this life—filled as it is with sorrows—it is necessary to know Christ, not as we know a stranger who passes through the street, but as we know our most intimate and beloved friend; in a word, we must love Christ.

It is Christ who assures us of a blessed immortality

And when the hour comes for us to quit this earth, in order that we may go in peace, we must believe in this blessed Son of God, who said to Martha, the sister of Lazarus, "I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth on Me, though he die, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth on Me, shall never die."[2]

[1] 1 Corinthians iii. 11.

[2] John xi. 25, 26.

FERDINAND CHRISTIAN BAUR

AND HIS

THEORY OF THE ORIGIN OF CHRISTIANITY

AND OF

THE NEW TESTAMENT WRITINGS

BY THE

REV. A. B. BRUCE, D.D.

Argument of the Tract.

It is pointed out that Baur exercises influence in this country through translations of his works, through the work entitled *Supernatural Religion*, and through the study of the Hegelian philosophy in the Universities.

A few biographical particulars concerning Baur are supplied.

The influence of Schleiermacher, Hegel, and Strauss, on the formation of his later views concerning Christianity, is briefly adverted to.

Then follows the exposition of these views, forming what is known as the Tübingen theory as to the origin of Christianity and the New Testament writings.

The theory is next criticised, the chief positions being these:—The theory is based on the two philosophical assumptions that the miraculous is impossible, and that all historical movements proceed according to the Hegelian law of development by antagonism; the alleged antagonism between Paul and the original Apostles has no real foundation in the New Testament; the criticism of New Testament books associated with this theory does not stand the test of impartial investigation; the theological tendencies ascribed to the writers of these books are, for the most part, imaginary.

Then follows a summary of these criticisms, and a reference to the good incidentally resulting from the promulgation of the theory.

The Tract concludes with a brief statement as to the nature of the Gospel and the harmony of the New Testament writings.

FERDINAND CHRISTIAN BAUR

AND HIS

THEORY OF THE ORIGIN OF CHRISTIANITY

AND OF

The New Testament Writings.

The subject not out of date.

It is now nearly half a century since the famous Tübingen theory as to the origin of Christianity and of the New Testament writings was propounded by the learned and able German theologian above named. The school of criticism founded by Dr. Baur is decadent, or nearly dead, in Germany; and many of the most characteristic positions of the founder have been conclusively refuted and abandoned even by his own disciples. But the movement he originated, though pretty well spent in his native country, has still vitality here, where it is of much more recent date; for it takes Continental waves of thought well-nigh a generation to reach our British shores. The English public have been made more generally acquainted with Dr. Baur and his views within the last twelve or fifteen years

Recent publications relating to it in England.

Super-natural Religion.

by translations of some of his works, and by the anonymous publication entitled *Supernatural Religion*, the commercial success of which—for it has passed through several editions—may be regarded as an index of the eager interest taken by a large public in such sceptical literature. Another fact which has to be taken into account is the present popularity in this country, at least in certain centres of learning, of the Hegelian philosophy.[1] As long as Hegel is in vogue, Baur will be in favour; for, as we shall see, Baur's theory is simply Hegelianism as understood by him, applied to the

The Hegelian philosophy at some of our Universities.

---

[1] It is not easy to indicate, in a few words, the character of this philosophy, about the significance of which even its adherents are much divided in opinion. It may, however, be described as an idealistic Pantheism. It differs from the system of Spinoza chiefly in two respects. First, in its conception of God: while, in the Spinozan system, the absolute being is conceived of as *substance*, in the Hegelian it is conceived of as *spirit*. Second, in the view taken of the connection between God, the world of nature, and man. In Spinoza's theory God is endowed with the attributes both of matter and of mind, and the phenomena of the material and spiritual universe are thought of as two parallel streams of being corresponding to each other, but not causally connected. In Hegel's theory God, nature, and man are thought of as a series or circle. God objectifies Himself in nature and rises out of nature, returns to Himself and becomes conscious of Himself, in man. This is the great process of the universe, and it answers to the process of the human mind in thought, which moves in a perpetual rhythm of affirmation, negation, and synthesis of opposites. This rhythmical movement is the law at once of logic, of history, and of the universe at large. The universe is a great movement of thought. We shall see further on the use made by Baur of this law in explaining the origin of Christianity.

fundamental problems of the Christian faith. It remains to add that Baur's influence is traceable even in quarters where it is strenuously resisted. Believing theologians in all parts of Europe have to notice him, however widely they differ from him. No one affects to ignore him.

The purpose of the Tract.

We cannot, therefore, regard ourselves as undertaking an idle task when we endeavour to expound and criticise, in a simple popular manner, a theory which makes Christianity a thing of purely natural origin, calls in question the authenticity of all but a few of the New Testament books, and makes the whole collection contain, not a harmonious system of Divine truth, but a confused mass of merely human and contradictory opinions as to the nature of the Christian religion.

It may increase the interest and gratify the natural curiosity of some of our readers if we preface our exposition and criticism with a few biographical particulars.

Biographical sketch

Ferdinand Christian Baur was born in 1792, in a village called Schmieden, near Stuttgart; but after his eighth year his boyhood was passed in a small town at the southern base of the Swabian Alps, called Blaubeuren, a few miles distant from Ulm. His father was a clergyman, and exercised his sacred office in both places successively in a diligent, conscientious manner, adding to his other duties the instruction of his son till his fourteenth

His education.

year. At that age the boy went to school, to the seminary of the place, called the Cloisters, proceeding to Tübingen in 1809. Both at school and at the university he developed a decided taste and talent for classical and philosophical studies. On leaving the university in 1814, he acted, for a year or two, as an assistant preacher in a rural parish. On the death of his father in 1817, he was appointed to a professorship in the seminary in Blaubeuren, where he very soon made his mark as a teacher, and counted among his pupils some youths who afterwards became famous: one being D. F. Strauss, author of *The Mythical Theory of the Life of Jesus.*

Professor at Tübingen.

In 1826, Baur was appointed to the vacant chair of historical theology in Tübingen, which he filled till his death in 1860.

His habits of study.

Baur was a hard student, exceptionally so even in Germany, where it is common for students to do an amount of brain work in a day which puts us of these islands to shame. After his appointment to the chair in Tübingen his habit was to rise, summer and winter, at four o'clock in the morning, working in winter for some hours without a fire, out of consideration for the domestics, though the cold was occasionally so severe that the ink was frozen! He worked at this rate from early morn till bed time, with only the necessary interruptions for public duties, meals, and exercise, to make himself master of the subjects which he had to teach; in which, being a shy, modest, scrupulously conscientious man, he deemed himself so deficient at the time of his appointment, that he felt inclined to refuse it. Whatever deficiencies he might be conscious of to begin with, it is easy to see that an able man with such extraordinary application was likely, ere long, to become a person of great learning, and, unless in this he was to be an exception among his countrymen, also a voluminous author. Baur was both in an eminent degree. His works exhibit immense learning, as well as transcendent ability, and they are very numerous, and on a great variety of subjects within the general limits of theology. In both respects he is one of the foremost figures in the whole history of German theological literature. However widely and seriously we dissent from his later views, with which his name is chiefly associated, it is only justice to pay this tribute at the outset to his fame as an author.[1]

His learning and ability.

"Later views" we have said; for Baur began his literary career very early, and his theological starting-point was very different from his goal. His first essay appeared in 1817, in a theological serial, and was orthodox and supernaturalistic in its attitude, after the tradition of the old Tübingen

His early views.

---

[1] The foregoing biographical particulars are taken from Zeller's article on Baur in his *Vorträge und Abhandlungen.* 1865.

His gradual progress to Naturalism.

school. The founder of the new Tübingen school passed from supernaturalism to thorough-going naturalism very gradually, and the process by which his ultimate scheme of thought was worked out in his mind has a long history. Among the influences to which the change is to be attributed a very prominent place is due to Schleiermacher, whose *Glaubenslehre*, first published in 1821, Baur studied with the receptive enthusiasm of youth, during the Blaubeuren period of his professional career. Schleiermacher has sent his disciples in very different directions; some upwards towards a fuller faith than his own, some downwards into the depths of theological negation. The impulse communicated to Baur was downward. The tendency and effect of Schleiermacher's exposition of the Christian faith are to reduce the supernatural to a minimum, and to make the little that remains appear as natural as possible, and so to satisfy the claims of science and philosophy, while endeavouring to do justice to the sentiments of believers. Christianity appears simply as one, though the best, of the forms which the religious consciousness has assumed in the religious history of mankind; Christ as the ideal man — consummation and crown of humanity, exhibited only in rude condition in the man of the first creation; and many doctrines previously deemed important are treated as of no essential moment. The disciple caught the

Schleiermacher's influence over Baur.

spirit of the master, and carried it out to consequences at which he stood aghast; treating, for example, the ideal humanity of Christ as a purely subjective notion, which had no foundation in the life of Jesus.[1]

Hegel's influence.

Another of Baur's masters was Hegel. Hegel's influence came later, and may not have been so deep or decisive as Schleiermacher's; for it is the favourite authors of our early years that tell upon us most powerfully. But it is apparent to any one who reads the works in which Baur expounds his theory respecting the origin of Christianity, such as *The History of Christianity in the Three First Centuries*,[2] how completely the great philosopher's system had taken possession of his mind. The style is completely overlaid by the characteristic phrases of the Hegelian philosophy. Nor is Hegel's influence a matter affecting merely the form of thought. From that philosopher Baur took the great law of *development by antagonism*, of which we shall have occasion to say more hereafter. We simply ask our readers to take preliminary note of the fact here.

Baur's fundamental principle derived from Hegel.

Another of the men from whom Baur received a powerful impulse was one of his Blaubeuren

---

[1] Vide Baur's work on Gnosticism: *Die Christliche Gnosis*, pp. 626–668.

[2] This forms the first volume of his great work on the Christian Church.

The influence of Strauss upon him.

pupils, Strauss. When Strauss' *Leben Jesu* appeared in 1835, Baur recognized at once its power and its defect. Its value for him lay in the completeness with which, as he thought, it demolished the traditional faith in the historical truth of the Gospel records, so clearing the way for critical inquiry into the genesis of these records. Its defect, in his view, was that it confined itself to criticism of the history, and did not attempt criticism of the writings. This defect Baur set himself to supply, striving to show how the various Gospels arose, and why it is that they cannot be trusted as sources of information concerning the life and teaching of Jesus.[1]

In proceeding now to expound Baur's theory concerning these Gospels, and the New Testament writings generally, and concerning the origin of Christianity, we ask our readers to remember that we concern ourselves only with those works of our author which directly bear on these topics. We have further to explain that our aim is not to show the genesis of the theory in the author's mind, but to exhibit it as it finally took shape—a fully developed and closely connected system of thought,—to exhibit it, not exhaustively, but in its main outlines.

Baur's theory.

According to this theory, then, the great out-

---

[1] His views on the Gospels are set forth in the work, *Die Kanonischen Evangelien.* 1847.

The supposed conflicting parties in the early Church.

standing fact regarding the Christianity of the apostolic age was a radical contrariety of view as to the nature and destination of the new religion, dividing the Church into two parties, one of which, headed by the Apostle Paul, held that the Gospel was for the world and for all, Jew and Gentile, on equal terms; while the other, having all the original apostles, the companions of Jesus, on its side, made Christianity essentially Jewish by insisting on the perpetual obligation of the Jewish law. The one was the party of the *Paulinists*, or Universalists; the other was the party of the *Judaists*. This controversy in its origin, progress, and termination by compromise or reconciliation, covered the history of the Church for a hundred years, from the time when Paul's principal epistles were written, down to a date somewhat later than the middle of the second century. All the writings of the New Testament, it is maintained, have reference to and spring out of the various stages of the controversy, and their approximate date can be determined by inspection of their contents, showing to which stage they must have belonged. Clear evidence, it is alleged, of the existence of this controversy can be discerned more or less in nearly all the books, but more especially in certain of their number. Before going into this, however, it may be well to go back to the fountain-head, and to consider the account given of the teaching

Paulinists and Universalists.

The origin of all the New Testament Scriptures traced to this controversy.

of the Founder of the faith. We shall thus become acquainted with Dr. Baur's conception of the Christianity of Christ, and learn what, in his opinion, were the elements therein which laid the foundation for subsequent misunderstanding.

Baur's views on the Christianity of Christ.

Christianity as taught by Jesus, according to Baur, was a purely natural product of certain influences, which can be specified. He attempts the same task with reference to the origin of Christianity, that Gibbon sought to accomplish with reference to its subsequent progress and triumph. And he gets rid of the supernatural in the same way as the great English historian, *i.e.*, not by formal argument directed against the possibility or reality of the miraculous, but by the tacit assumption that there were no miracles to be accounted for, and by an enumeration of natural causes, which of themselves appear to him quite sufficient to account for the rise of the new religion. The author very distinctly indicates his attitude in the opening sentences of his work on *Christianity and the Christian Church of the Three First Centuries.* He says:—

He assumes that there were no miracles.

> "In no department of historical inquiry does all that relates to the contents of a definite series of historical phenomena depend so much on the initial point from which it starts, as in the history of the Christian Church; nowhere does so much depend as here, on the conception we form of the point from which the whole historical course takes its beginning. The historian who comes to the task with the faith of the Church stands at its threshold before the wonder of all wonders, before the original fact of Christianity—that the Son of God descended

> from the eternal throne of Godhead to this earth, and became man in the womb of the Virgin. He who sees in this an absolute miracle, puts himself thereby outside of all historical connection. A miracle is an absolute beginning, and the more this beginning conditions all that follows, the more must the whole series of the phenomena which belong to the subject of Christianity bear the same stamp of the miraculous. . . . Historical investigation has therefore very naturally an interest in drawing even the miracle of the absolute beginning into the historical connection, and resolving it as far as possible into its natural elements."

His account of the component elements of Christianity.

What, then, were these natural elements which together constituted the Christianity of Christ? Baur answers this question very explicitly. There were four elements, for which, as he thinks, Christianity was indebted to the previous history of the world. These were its *universalistic spirit*, its *subjectivity* or *spirituality*, its *pure monotheism*, and its *ascetic ideal of life.* The first it got from Rome, the seat of a universal empire; the second from Greece, which had been taught by the Athenian sage that the first business of man was to know himself, and to realize his importance as a moral subject; the third from the Hebrew Scriptures, as interpreted by the Alexandrian philosophy, represented by Philo, whereby the Jewish idea of God was purged from particularism, and adapted to the requirements of a universal religion; and the fourth from the Jewish anchorites, known by the name of the *Essenes.*

Whence they were derived.

Christ's merit was to discern these essential features in the religious movements of the past, to appreciate their importance for the present, and to see in them the germs out of which might spring a great future. No less, but also no more. Universalism was in the air, and it only required a sympathetic powerful mind to lay hold of it, and introduce it into the sphere of religion, and make it valid there. It was to be expected that some one would arise to become in religion the mouthpiece of the Time-spirit; and from the nature of the case it was also to be expected that when the Man appeared he would not speak in vain, for the hour was propitious. Political Universalism preexisting insured success for religious Universalism adequately proclaimed.

Universalism.

Spirituality.

So likewise with the second element, *spirituality*. "Know thyself," Socrates had said, and the word had gone sounding down the ages, audible to an ever-increasing number of men, awakening responsive echoes in the schools of philosophy; Stoics, Epicureans, Sceptics, and Eclectics vying with each other in the emphasis of their response; till at length the voice was caught up by the sage of Galilee, and re-uttered in his own dialect, with a power sufficient to create a new world, founded on faith in the infinite importance of man as a moral personality—a faith which, making all turn on the spirit, was therefore fit to be the faith of all, the religion of humanity.

Not less indebted to the past, according to Dr

Idea of God and human life.

Baur, was Jesus, even for his ideas of God, and of human life. His Father-God, beautiful as the conception is, was simply the God of Israel humanized by means of the philosophy of Philo. His severe maxims of conduct, prescribing a life of self-denial, and his beatitudes on poverty, emanated from the shores of the Dead Sea, where the Essene brotherhood spent their days in retirement from the world.

The Messianic idea.

Such, according to the Tübingen theory, were the elements of the religious idea of Jesus, and such their supposed sources. But these by themselves would not have sufficed to make Jesus the power he became. In order to succeed he must avail himself of the *Messiah-idea*, and offer himself to his countrymen as the fulfiller of Messianic hopes. The Genius of the new religion happening to be a Jew, no other pathway to influence was open. The claim to be Messiah might not help him all at once to become a world-power; but it was indispensable in order to His gaining a footing among his own people, and that was the necessary first step towards universal empire. The Messianic idea in itself was but a dream, and Jesus to a certain extent was aware of the fact; nevertheless it could not be ignored, for the Jewish nation earnestly believed in it. Any man seeking to influence decisively the Jewish mind must recognize the Messianic hope as a fact, and accom-

According to Baur Jesus had to accommodate himself to it.

modate himself to it. If he aspired to be a supreme religious benefactor to the chosen race, he must even call himself the Messiah. In Judæa to say, "I bring to you the *summum bonum,*" and to say, "I am the Messiah," were one and the same thing. In Baur's own words:

> "Nothing of higher moment could happen on the soil of Jewish popular religious history which did not either connect itself with the Messiah idea, or was not introduced by it. Thus was indicated to Christianity the way which it had to take."[1]

Two things apparently conflicting meet, from which controversy may arise.

Observe now what we have got. Jesus on the one hand teaches a religion universalistic in spirit—for all mankind, not for Jews alone; on the other He claims to be the Jewish Messiah. Two things thus meet in Him which may not be irreconcilable, but which wear a superficial aspect of antagonism that may easily give rise to contrariety of view and controversy. Some of those who espouse the new religion may emphasize the universalism of Christ's teaching, and others may attach chief importance to His Messiahship, and hence may come conflict. For the ultimate fortunes of the new religion this may not be a calamity. On Hegelian principles, indeed, it may confidently be expected to be the reverse; for according to these all progress and development proceed by conflict. From this point of view it is desirable that conflict as to the nature of Chris-

Conflict desirable in Hegelian principles.

---

[1] *Geschichte der Christlichen Kirche*, i. 37.

tianity should arise; the new movement will come to nothing unless it do arise. There need be no great fear on this score, as human beings generally do manage to get up controversies about matters in which they are deeply interested, especially in the sphere of religion. There may, however, be some difficulty in getting a worthy representative of the universalism of Christianity. The narrower view will look after itself, for the multitude incline to narrow ideas; but what if no effective advocate of a Gospel for the world should appear?

An early difficulty.

Here is one possible difficulty in the way of getting Christianity started on its career. Another very serious one coming in at an earlier stage arises out of the death of Jesus. Must not that event be fatal to the cause? Yes, replies Dr. Baur, unless it can be got over somehow. It would effectually meet the difficulty if the dead one should rise again. That, however, from the Tübingen point of view is impossible, and the next best thing is that the disciples should persuade themselves that their Master has risen, which is happily not impossible. Faith in the resurrection will serve the same purpose as the resurrection itself, give heart to the followers of Jesus to go forth as the apostles of the Christian religion.

How to surmount it.

What the eleven will preach may be guessed beforehand. They are all commonplace men, incapable of entering into the world-wide aims of

Who is to represent Universalism.

their Lord. But where then are the representatives of Christian universalism to come from? By the nature of the case they must be few, for they must be superior men rising above the average level in genius, earnestness, and force, belonging to the aristocracy of humanity, the number of whom is always small. What if such rare men capable of being mouthpieces of universalism should not be forthcoming? Why then Christianity may come to nothing after all, for want of the antagonism which is the necessary condition of historical development. The risk is real; yet may we not fall back on the consoling thought that at every great crisis the needed man always makes his appearance, if not sent by the living God, then produced by the unconscious forces at work in the universe? However this may be, the fact is that one adequate representative of universalism did make his appearance in due season—we might say two indeed,—the first being *Stephen*, the second *Paul*. Stephen, however, was only a blossom nipped by persecution, so that of Paul alone need we take account.

Saul of Tarsus.

That Saul of Tarsus, once a Pharisaic zealot and bitter opponent of Christianity, should be changed into a Christian, and *such* a Christian:—not merely a believer in Jesus as the Christ, but entering with all the enthusiasm of a passionate nature, and all the logical consistency of a powerful intellect, into

His own version.

the universal aspect of Christ's teaching, treating that which had once been everything to him,—the *law,* as nothing, and insisting that in Christ is no distinction between Jew and Gentile, but only a new humanity, is a sufficiently remarkable phenomenon. It is one of the great difficulties which naturalistic criticism has to grapple with, for to account for Paul's conversion on naturalistic principles is a hard task. Baur, conscious of this, did not attempt to explain the fact, but left the unsolved problem to other more adventurous spirits. Enough for him that Paul the persecutor was converted somehow. In the converted Pharisee was at length provided what was needed to insure for Christianity a career. The opposing views are now furnished with advocates. In Paul, universalism has got a champion able single-handed to defend it against all comers. The Judaistic tendency on the other hand, as already hinted, has numerous if not equally able advocates in the eleven companions of Jesus. The state of the case is thus Paul versus the whole body of the original apostles—at least according to Dr. Baur.[1]

Unexplained by Baur.

Representatives of Judaism.

Paul and the Eleven.

The evidence of the conflict.

But what evidence is there of the alleged contrariety between the eleven on the one hand and Paul on the other, in their respective views of the Gospel? If such diversity existed there ought to be clear traces of it in the New Testament. And the Tübingen critic tells us that there are, and undertakes to point them out. He finds in various places plain indications of conflict between Paul and at least two of the original apostles—the men of most influence, the pillars of the Church, viz., Peter and John. Of the opposition between Paul and John the proof is drawn from the Book of Revelation, which is regarded as the work of John the apostle, and as the only genuine Johannine writing in the New Testament. The Balaamites, Nicolaitanes, or followers of the woman Jezebel, who eat flesh offered to idols, are the members of the Pauline party in the churches of Asia Minor. The text, xxi. 14, in which the number twelve is applied to the apostles as corresponding to the twelve tribes of Israel, evidently excludes Paul from the apostolate. When the Church of Ephesus is praised for testing some who called themselves apostles, and were not, Paul and his associates are obviously aimed at.

---

[1] Baur's views on Paul, his life, work, and writings, are set forth in his work : *Paulus der Apostel Jesu Christi.*

Alleged conflict between Peter and John.

Supposed allusions to St. Paul in the Revelations.

Paul and Peter.

Of the opposition between Paul and Peter traces are found in the reference in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, to parties existing among them, one of which named itself after Paul, and another after Peter; and in the account given by Paul in his Epistle to the Galatians of his collision with Peter at Antioch. Both these Epistles are held to be unquestionably of Pauline authorship, and therefore absolutely trustworthy. The main stress of the argument turns on the passage in Galatians (ii. 11–21), and indeed we may say on the whole of the second chapter of that remarkable Epistle, from which it is inferred that Paul stood opposed not only to Peter but to the whole eleven. The "false brethren" (v. 4) are held to be the eleven. The phrases "those who seemed to be somewhat," "who seemed to be pillars," are taken to be sneering allusions to the esteem in which the eleven were held by the Judaistic party. The giving of the right hand of fellowship at the close of the conference, was, we are told, but a hollow truce between two irreconcilable parties, an agreement that each party should continue to hold its own views, and that they should divide the world between them.

The scene at Antioch and its consequences.

The subsequent scene at Antioch shows Peter standing on the platform of a Jewish-Christian halfness, binding together faith and the ceremonial law, and deeming the keeping of the law necessary to salvation though not of itself sufficient for salvation; and we are given to understand that the effect of Paul's energetic remonstrance was a permanent alienation between him and Peter, fruitful of evil consequences.

Alleged anti-Pauline Propagandism.

One of the most grievous results was the rise of a Judaistic Anti-Pauline propagandism which assiduously carried on its operations in all the churches founded by the apostle of the Gentiles.

2 Corinthians and Romans.

The alleged origin of the Epistle to the Romans.

Traces of the alleged antagonism between Paul and the original apostles are discovered in the only two other epistles which, besides the above named, are recognised as Pauline, 2 *Corinthians* and *Romans.* In the former the expression "superlative apostles," apostles ever-so-much,[1] is held to be a sarcastic reference to the eleven. The Epistle to the Romans, though containing no express reference to parties in the Church, according to Baur, owed its origin to these. His theory is that Paul wrote the epistle to a Church he had not founded or visited, in which, therefore, he had no personal enemies, that he might in a didactic way give a full demonstration of his universalistic view of Christianity in opposition to Judaistic particularism. The kernel of the Epistle is thus to be found in the ninth, tenth, and eleventh chapters, in which the writer endeavours to adjust his Gentile Gospel to the prerogatives of the Jewish nation as an elect people.

Such is the evidence adduced in proof of irreconcilable, or at least serious antagonism between Paul and the Eleven, and the two great parties into which the Apostolic Church was divided, the universalist party having Paul at its head, and the Judaist party led by the former companions of Jesus. The subsequent course of events is supposed to have been this: After the controversy had raged fiercely for a time, the men of a later generation began to grow weary of strife, and to long for and aim at a reconciliation, in the belief that the opposing views were not so utterly incompatible as their fathers had imagined. And so it came to pass that the war of parties ceased, and the Catholic Church was formed by their union, and a composite creed framed, which blended together the watchwords of opposite camps. Thus the history of the Church for a hundred years, dating from the time of Paul, has three periods. First there is the period of controversy; second, the period during which the process of conciliation went on; third, the period when that process reached its completion.

---

[1] 2 Cor. xi. 5, τῶν ὑπερλίαν ἀποστόλων; "the chiefest apostles" in Authorized Version.

The subsequent course of events.

Three periods.

According to the theory we are now expounding, all the books of the New Testament belong to one or other of these periods. One group sprang out of the great controversy, and express the views and passions of the combatants; a second group bear traces of being written under the influence of the spirit of conciliation; a third speak the thoughts of an age when union had been achieved, and the memory of past strife was fading away. All the writings without exception are supposed to betray the influence of a theological tendency; the only difference between them being the particular tendencies by which they are respectively animated.

New Testament books in relation to these.

Earliest writings controversial.

First in time came the controversial group, embracing five books: the *Apocalypse*, written by the Apostle John, and the four Epistles of Paul alone recognized as genuine, those to the *Galatian*, *Corinthian*, and *Roman* Churches. These books alone of all the books in the New Testament are held to be of apostolic authorship; and of course they were the earliest written, from the simple fact of their belonging to the period of controversy. An inexperienced person might naturally suggest that there was an earlier period still, that of Christ Himself, and ask why there should not have been earlier writings, telling in simple unsophisticated language the story of His life? But we are given to understand that no such books are to be found in the New Testament, not even in the case of the Gospels. They also are writings with a tendency, and relate the history of Jesus with a distinct colouring. Their proper place, in short, is in one of the next two groups.

Second group conciliatory.

The second group, wherein traces of the spirit of conciliation are discernible, is a much larger one than the first, embracing the first three, commonly called Synoptical, Gospels, Acts, the Epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians, and Philippians, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Epistles of James and Peter. The interest in connection with this group revolves chiefly around the historical books,—the Synoptical Gospels and the Acts of the

Apostles. With reference to these, the theory now under consideration undertakes to explain their respective rôles in the drama of reconciliation.

The first and third Gospels.

The first and third Gospels, which bear the names of Matthew and Luke, had for their authors men belonging to opposite parties, but each animated by a conciliatory spirit. The former was written by a Judaist, who told the story of our Lord's life so as to make it acceptable to Paulinists, and the latter by a Paulinist, who constructed his narrative in the same friendly spirit as towards Judaists, while contriving to make it tell very decisively in favour of Gentile Christianity. Both Gospels are based on older forms in which the life of Jesus was presented from partisan points of view: "Matthew," on a Gospel current among the Ebionites called the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*; "Luke," on the solitary Gospel acknowledged and used by Marcion, the Gnostic heretic, the contents of which we learn from a controversial work against Marcion by Tertullian. Tertullian's view as to this Gospel of Marcion's was that it was a mutilated edition of the canonical Luke, with everything omitted that savoured of Judaism, or was distasteful to a man who thought the Old Testament religion and Christianity so different that they could not proceed from the same God. The Tübingen theory inverts the state of the case, and maintains that Marcion's Gospel

Marcion's Gospel.

was earlier than the canonical Luke; that in it the life of Christ was related with a strong Paulinist bias; and that at a later date a Paulinist animated by a conciliatory aim, took it up, added to it, toned it down, and so made it palatable to Jewish tastes, while still retaining a strong flavour of universalism.

Mark's Gospel.

As for the author of the second Gospel a very ignoble part is assigned to him. He is supposed to have had both the first and the third Gospels before him, and to have compiled his narrative in a spirit of neutrality, leaving out everything in either of his predecessors that leant too decidedly to either side. A book got up in this way ought to be a very dull uninteresting affair. But it so happens that Mark's narrative is particularly lively and graphic. In explanation of this we are told that the graphic element has been introduced to hide the poverty of an otherwise colourless recital.

Alleged dates of the Synoptic Gospels.

It hardly needs to be stated that, according to Dr. Baur, the Synoptical Gospels, as we now have them, are all of comparatively late date. All books of a conciliatory tendency must have been post-apostolic. Luke's Gospel, if made up from that used by Marcion, cannot have been written much before A.D. 150, Marcion's date being about 140. *Matthew* is supposed to have been written some twenty years earlier than Luke, and *Mark* rather later than the middle of the second century.

The Acts of the Apostles.

The mode in which the theory deals with *The Acts of the Apostles* is very naïve. It is represented as an apologetic work, having for its aim to bring Judaists and Paulinists into fraternal relations, and adopting for this end the expedient of making Peter, the head of the Judaistic party, act as much as possible after the manner of Paul, and Paul, in the second part, as much as possible after the manner of Peter. The idea that the work had an apologetic aim had been previously promulgated by *Schneckenburger*,[1] who, however, had no intention of calling in question its historical reliableness, his view being that the aim of the writer influenced him only in the *selection* of his material. But in the hands of Dr. Baur what Schneckenburger called selection became *invention*. That some historical facts are contained in the book possibly derived from manuscripts of Luke he did not deny; but in many sections he saw nothing else than pure inventions to serve a purpose. He supposes the work to have been written at a time when the opposed parties, having already made considerable approximations, and being desirous of complete union, needed only to be told that the notion of a radical antagonism between Peter and Paul was a mistake, that in views and public action they were very much alike, and that there

Its supposed aim and method.

---

[1] In a work on the aim of the Acts (*über den Zweck der Apostelgeschichte.* 1841).

had always been a good understanding between them. The book, he says,

> "is the conciliatory effort and overture of peace of a Paulinist, who would purchase the recognition of Gentile Christianity by Jewish Christians, by concessions to Judaism in the name of his own party."[1]

Examples.

Cornelius.

It would be tedious to go into detail to illustrate the working out of this amiable programme. Suffice it to say that the story of Cornelius is supposed to be invented in order to represent Peter as equally with Paul a believer in the universal destination of the Gospel, and in the consequent antiquation of the ceremonial law. The account of the Council of Jerusalem was concocted to make it appear that on the question regarding circumcision, the elder apostles and Paul were in perfect accord. Even the story of Simon Magus is held to be an invention to meet a difficulty in the way of mediation. For the original of Simon Magus, we are assured, is the Apostle Paul. Under that name he figures in the *Clementines*, a writing proceeding from the Judaist party, and full of bitterness against Paul, who, under the disguise of Simon Magus, appears as the enemy of the Gospel, following in the footsteps of Peter, and striving to mar his work as an apostle. The author of *Acts* being acquainted with the Simon-myth, and aware how current it was, could not ignore it; but to neutralize its effect as

The Council of Jerusalem.

The story of Simon Magus.

---

[1] *Geschicte der Christlichen Kirche*, p. 128.

a story fitted to perpetuate hostility against Paul, and stereotype existing alienations, he adopted the expedient of bringing the Apostle Peter and Simon Magus into contact before Paul appeared on the stage of history, to suggest the inference that the identification of Simon with Paul was another historical blunder!

The last group representing according to Baur, the period of completed reconciliation.

The last group of New Testament writings, representing the period of completed reconciliation, embraces the *Pastoral Epistles*—those to Timothy and Titus, and the *Fourth Gospel*, and the *Epistles ascribed to John.* In common with the Epistles to Ephesians, Colossians, and Philippians the Pastorals have for their task to deal with the difficulties in the way of the construction or consolidation of the Catholic Church arising from the heretical movements that were so rife in the second century, those especially associated with the name of the Gnostics. But they deal with the difficulty in another way. The Epistles to Ephesians, Colossians, and Philippians deal with Gnostic error doctrinally, appropriating whatever was in affinity with Christianity and rejecting the rest. The Pastoral Epistles, on the other hand, deal with Gnostic error ecclesiastically, seeking to fortify the Church against heretical influence by the establishment of an ecclesiastical hierarchy. The Church could not be strong as long as she was without an organization binding her into a compact body, and

Baur's view of the purpose of the Pastoral Epistles.

the means of unity was found in the Episcopate; and the Pastorals are devoted to the task of erecting the Episcopal system. From this view of their origin it follows of course that these Epistles could not have been written by Paul, or indeed earlier than the middle of the second century,

The fourth Gospel.

Last in time, though not in importance, comes the *Fourth Gospel.* This book, according to Dr. Baur, was written by a *Christian Gnostic*, who in his idea of Christianity soared high above the antagonisms of the past, and welded them together into an indissoluble unity. In place of apostles contending together for sovereignty comes in this Gospel the Holy Spirit as the universal Christian principle common to both Peter and Paul, and the tendencies they represent. In the Johannine theology Judaism and Paulinism lose their distinctive features, and are merged in a higher unity. Faith, in the fourth Gospel, is a principle of fundamental importance not less than in the Pauline system; but the object of faith is not Christ's death, but Christ's person, Christ being viewed as the Logos incarnate, yea God Himself. Then in the fourth Gospel faith, however important, is still subordinate to love. Love is the highest idea in the Johannine theology. Then as for the Law, of which so much is said by Paul, and whose claims he shows himself so anxious to satisfy in his theory of salvation, in the fourth Gospel it is spoken of as something anti-

Features of this Gospel.

quated, as something with which the Christian has nothing to do, and which has no claims to be considered. In love, faith and works find their higher unity, and lose their separate existence; and the particularism of Judaism, with all the antagonisms connected with it, disappears in the general contrast of the two opposed principles of Light and Darkness, which forms the background of the writer's theory of the universe. Thus this Gospel represents the final stage of the process of development in which the end returns to the beginning, giving instead of the immediate unity of opposites in Christ's teaching, a unity mediated by conflict, and all the richer on that account. The probable date of the Gospel is alleged to be between 160 and 170.

The alleged probable date of the Gospel.

The theory outlined.

Such in brief outline is the theory. In proceeding now to criticise this theory, it is unnecessary to say that we are fully sensible of its cleverness and boldness, and of the vast learning and infinite ingenuity with which it is supported. These are altogether very imposing and fascinating, and it takes a little time for the admiring reader of Dr. Baur's books to recover himself. But by and by it becomes apparent that the theory has many vulnerable points.

Two philosophical assumptions.

In the first place, while professedly historical and critical in its method, the theory is based upon two philosophical assumptions, one being that the miraculous is impossible, the other that all historical development must proceed according to the laws of Hegelian logic. The former needs only to be stated; on the latter a few sentences of explanation may be offered.

Hegelianism in form and spirit.

In the foregoing exposition we have kept Hegelianism well in the background, partly that we might not trouble our readers with unfamiliar and repulsive phrases, and partly in justice to Dr. Baur; for it would not be fair to suggest or imply that he brought a cut and dry *à priori* philosophy to his task, and then proceeded to discover or invent facts which should make history square with foregone speculative conclusions. Nevertheless it is the simple truth that the Tübingen theory is Hegelian, not only in form but in spirit. The account given of the origin of Christianity is as completely dominated by the Hegelian law of development by antagonism as if the author had set himself this problem: "On the principles of Hegelianism the course taken by Christianity must have been as follows. In Christ, the founder of the new religion must meet two principles opposed to each other. In a subsequent stage these opposed principles must pass into a state of open conflict, each becoming the distinctive watchword of a party. Then, finally, the two principles must pass from a state of antagonism into a state of reconciliation, and become again, as at the commencement, united, constituting together in developed

The problem to be solved according to Hegelian principles.

form the faith of the Catholic Church. Find facts to verify this hypothesis."

The Hegelian mode of handling history.

The inevitable consequence of this philosophic bias is apparent in Baur's writings. The account given of the origin of Christianity and its canonical literature is not history, but a gross caricature. It is, to say the least, very improbable that the real course of history should follow so closely the requirements of a philosophical system. The attempt to make it appear as if it did, will almost certainly transform the actors in the historical drama into puppets, mouthpieces of tendencies, passive instruments of "the Idea." Such, indeed, is the well-known vice of the Hegelian method of handling history. Competent and even friendly critics have remarked that on that method historical characters are not real men, but ghostly generalities. Logic is the all-controlling power. Logical categories of the widest kind: Being in itself, Being for self, Being in and for self, the Indifference, the Difference, the Unity of the difference and the indifference, and so forth, take the place of the historical categories, and are so operated with, that history has all the blood sucked out of it, and historical characters become dead idea schemes.[1]

What Christ becomes in Baur's hands.

Thus Christ Himself, in Baur's hands, becomes little more than a centre of unity for two opposed tendencies—the teacher of a universal ethical religion, and a claimant for the honours of Messiahship. Anything additional, putting more contents into the person and teaching of Jesus than suits the initial stage of development, must be reckoned spurious. If we find Jesus in any of the Gospels claiming to be a superhuman being, such texts may with the utmost confidence be set down as spurious. Such a thought could not possibly belong to the initial stage, but only to the final, when the human Messiah had developed into a Deity through the love and reverence of His followers. For the same reason all texts concerning the atoning significance of Christ's death must be relegated to a later time.

---

[1] So Schwartz, in a work on the history of recent German theology.

On his theory superhuman elements in the gospels to be rejected.

The Tubingen theorists are tendency critics.

In the same way, all the writers of the New Testament books become ghosts instead of living men. None of them are allowed to tell their story in good faith and natural simplicity. Every one of them must be the conscious constant mouthpiece of a theological tendency, either of the antagonisms, or of the conciliatory movement, or of the completed union. Paul must be a hotheaded universalist, John a bigoted Judaist, the writer of Acts the deliberate inventor of a historical romance intended to serve the purposes of conciliation, and so on through the whole list. In short, whatever be the truth as to the allegation that the New Testament books are all tendency-writings, there can be no doubt that the Tübingen theorists are tendency critics, have tendency on the brain, so to speak; insomuch that one who has become familiar with their method can tell beforehand what they will say about any particular book.

The initial stage.

Thus far of general characteristics. Let us now look at some points in detail, and first at the account given of the initial stage. Baur's representation of the teaching of Jesus is not altogether false. It is especially true in so far as it makes spirituality and universality essential characteristics of the Christian religion as exhibited by its Founder. These were indeed the grand features of the kingdom He proclaimed. But the theory errs in tracing these to Gentile sources. The political universalism of Rome, and the ethical subjectivity of Greece, did not give Jesus His doctrine, but merely prepared the world for receiving it. He was not a slavish debtor even to the Old Testament, either for these parts of His teaching, or for His doctrine of God. His great thoughts of the Divine Fatherhood, and of the dignity of man as God's son, and of the Kingdom of love have their roots in Old Testament prophecy. Nevertheless their marvellous originality is undeniable. As for the assertion that Jesus owed His ideal of human life to the Essenes, it is utterly baseless. In the first place, there is not the slightest trace of a historical connection between Him and the Essenes; in the second place, it is not the fact that His view of life is ascetic. The morality of the Gospel is heroic, abstinence being enjoined not as a virtue in itself, but as a sacrifice on the altar of devotion to the kingdom. The ideal of Christian character is not the monk, but the soldier. The two coincide in particular acts, but how diverse the spirit in which the same acts are performed!

That Jesus claimed to be the Messiah an important admission.

On the other hand, the assertion that Jesus claimed and accepted the title of Messiah is unquestionably true. It is an important admission on Dr. Baur's part, for it is fatal both to his theory and to that of Strauss. To the former, because a Messiah was required by public expectation to play the part of a miracle-worker in order to gain credence, a part not easy to play successfully, if miracles are impossible. To the latter, because, according to the mythical hypothesis, miraculous narratives are the product of faith in the Messiahship of Jesus, whereas if Jesus really claimed to be the Messiah, faith in His Messianic claims must have been the effect of miracles, real or reputed.

The alleged rise of two parties.

Passing now to the stage of controversy, when, according to the theory, two parties arose, one fighting for a Christianity which was merely a reformed Judaism, having for its creed that the man Jesus was the Christ; the other contending for a worldwide Christianity independent of Judaism—the point of importance here is, how far is the alleged contrariety between the original apostles and Paul

Improbable that the eleven were Judaists.

a matter of fact Now the alleged radical antagonism is antecedently very improbable, even if only for the simple reason that the Eleven had been for years the companions of Jesus, the Teacher, Dr. Baur himself being witness, of a universal religion. Is it credible that the men who "had been with Jesus" so long, remained utterly insensible to the Master's spirit of catholic human sympathy, and to the universalistic genius of the new religious movement? That were to say that they were totally unworthy to be Christ's disciples, and that the careful training to which they had been subjected was a complete failure. Sensible of this, Ritschl, once himself an adherent of Dr. Baur's, speaks of it as historically impossible

> "that the view of the autonomy and universality of Christianity, which filled the inner life of Jesus, remained hid from His personal disciples."[1]

The proof examined

But what of the proof adduced to show that, whatever might be *à priori* to be looked for, such contrariety did exist as matter of fact? Speaking generally, the interpretation put upon the texts cited must be pronounced strained. Such is the opinion even of theologians altogether free from orthodox bias, naturalistic in their philosophy, and followers of Baur to a certain extent. Keim, *e.g.*, entirely dissents from Baur's reading of the second chapter of *Galatians*, holding that the original apostles did not insist on the circumcision of Gentile converts, and that it was owing to their generous and magnanimous bearing that the church was brought to accept the Jerusalem compact.[1] The scene at Antioch, read without bias, does not at all bear out the notion of an opposition in principle between Paul and Peter. What Paul charges his brother disciple with is not holding Judaistic opinions, but hypocrisy, inconsistency in conduct, through moral weakness, with his avowed principles, which as described by Paul are identical with his own. To call Peter a Judaist, on the ground of that passage, would be as unreasonable as to call him a traitor because through fear of man he denied a Master whom all the time he dearly loved. In both crises of his history Peter revealed the same moral weakness; in the earlier instance, denying his Lord through fear of the ridicule of servant-maids; in the latter, turning his back on Gentile Christians, with whom he had previously had no scruples in freely associating through fear of Judaistic bigots from Jerusalem.

---

[1] *Die Entstehung der Altkatholischen Kirche*, p. 47.

Paul's charge against Peter.

If the attempted proof breaks down in the texts cited from the Epistle to the Galatians it is hardly worth while examining the weaker links in the chain of evidence taken from other places.

Real difference between Paul and the eleven.

In denying the alleged Judaistic bias of Peter, James, John, and the rest of the Eleven, we do not mean to say that they were enthusiastic advocates of Christian universalism, like Paul, the Apostle of the Gentiles. That they certainly were not. They passed through no intense religious experience like his, fitted to make them such. Their position was that of men brought gradually to acquiesce calmly though decidedly in the admission of Gentile believers to the full fellowship of the Church, on the sole ground of faith in Christ, apart from circumcision. They accepted the situation as the will of God clearly manifested by events, and as in accordance with the whole spirit of their Master's teaching. They did not, like Paul, throw themselves into the new situation with passionate earnestness. Therefore it was that they did not then at least desire to be apostles to the Gentiles. They felt that they were not fitted to become signally successful agents in that sphere. They humbly acknowledged that they were not called to that work. Their judgment was wise as well as honourable to themselves. For something more than acceptance of the situation is wanted in the apostles of a religious revolution. When the Christian faith took root in the Gentile city of Antioch, the good genial Barnabas knew that there was just one man who was supremely qualified to guide the movement. He went down to Tarsus to seek *Saul.*[1]

---

[1] Vide *Aus dem Urchristenthum;* iv. *Der Apostel Konvent.*

Contrast between the experience of the eleven and the experience of Paul.

The eleven not fitted to be apostles to the Gentiles.

Saul supremely qualified for this office.

---

[1] Acts xi. 25.

Diverse views in the Apostolic Church.

Another admission must be made. While serious conflict of opinion between Paul and the Eleven is denied, it is not denied that there were grave differences of opinion within the Church. But the apostles being at one, such contrariety of view can be regarded only as a fact of subordinate importance, wholly unfit to support a huge superstructure of criticism like that presented in the literature of the Tübingen theory. That criticism we must now briefly notice.

Tubingen criticism of New Testament examined.

As already remarked, the general character of the Tübingen criticism of the New Testament books is, that it carries the hypothesis of tendency to extravagant lengths. Every writer must be the mouthpiece of some phase in the great dialectic movement, which is to have for its issue the creation of the Christian creed and of the Catholic Church. The penalty of all exaggeration is reaction, and accordingly the conclusions of the Tübingen criticism have been largely modified by later investigations as conducted by men untrammelled by orthodox traditions, such as Keim, Renan, Hilgenfeld, Pfleiderer. Recent critics, *e.g.*, are generally agreed that besides the four epistles recognized as genuine by Dr. Baur, a large proportion of the other epistles ascribed to Paul must be acknowledged to be genuine. Serious doubt, even in sceptical quarters, now hovers only over the Epistle to the Ephesians, and the pastoral Epistles.

Pauline Epistles.

The Synoptic Gospels. Matthew and Mark.

In like manner the historicity, the *bona fides*, and the artlessness of the Gospels, at least the Synoptics, receive from most recent inquirers an ampler homage. Dr. Baur himself recognized the comparative reliableness of *Matthew* as a source of information concerning the life and ministry of Jesus, so that little need be said on that topic. His views respecting *Mark* and *Luke* are now generally discredited. *Mark*, instead of being the latest, is now by most critics deemed the earliest of the Synoptical Gospels, and valued as a fresh vivid presentation of the leading scenes in the personal ministry, taken from the mouth of an eye-witness.

Luke.

The Tübingen view of Luke, according to which it is a revision of an earlier form of the Gospel known as Marcion's, is finally exploded. Even the author of *Supernatural Religion* confesses himself convinced by the reasoning of Dr. Sanday, in his thorough discussion of the question in his valuable work on *The Gospels in the Second Century*. When he yields the point, the most sceptical may be satisfied that there is no room for even plausible contention against the position that in the canonical Luke we have the original form of the third Gospel.

Paulinistic bias of Luke.

This Gospel, according to Dr. Baur, is to a very great extent influenced in its representation of the evangelic history by a Paulinist or Gentile bias. Proofs of this he finds in certain divergencies from Matthew, assumed to be the more trustworthy account. They are the following: Matthew knows only of one scene of Christ's ministry, Galilee; Luke tells of two ministries, one in Galilee, another in Samaria. Samaria represents the Gentile world, and the Samaritan mission is an invention. Besides the mission of the twelve, Luke relates the mission of the seventy, and, as if to make it appear the more important, he borrows from the earlier a large part of the instructions given to the Galilean evangelists, and attaches them to the later. The seventy represent the Gentile nations, supposed to be equal in number, and their mission is a pure invention to give the Gentile mission of later days a footing in the life of Jesus. The Sermon on the Mount, as reported in Matthew, is broken up by Luke and dispersed over his pages, as if to make the ordination of the twelve seem an event of little significance.

Facts in proof.

These are plausibilities, but little more. As to the first it is not the intention of the third evangelist to relate a formal and elaborate ministry on Samaritan ground. The utmost that can be said is that he introduces some stray Samaritan incidents in themselves perfectly credible. A Paulinistic bias may have led him to introduce into his narrative these incidents found in his sources. If so, we should be thankful for his Paulinism, that is, his keen interest in Gentile

Facts explained

Christianity, to which we owe precious fragments that we should have been sorry to lose. The mission of the seventy has its difficulties, chiefly this, that it is not easy to make room and scope for it at the stage of the history at which it comes in. The best way of dealing with it is to treat it as not more, but less, important than the mission of the twelve; and to regard the distribution of the words of Jesus between the two missions as due to the way in which they were given in Luke's sources. Finally, the dispersion of the materials of the Sermon on the Mount raises the question: did Luke disperse or did Matthew collect? The one hypothesis is as legitimate as the other.

The true character of this Gospel.

The opinion of dispassionate critics, who have no theory to make out, is that the third evangelist was a candid chronicler, who, in all good faith, made the best use of the materials at his command in the various documents to which he alludes at the beginning of his Gospel. He was certainly not a dry historian, who felt no religious interest in what he wrote. He rejoiced to believe that the Gospel of Jesus was emphatically a gospel of grace, and therefore a gospel for social outcasts and for Gentiles; and he was careful in the selection of his materials to make this conspicuous. Thereby his Gospel has only gained in spiritual value, without losing in historical reliableness.

The Acts of the Apostles.

A similar view is to be taken of the Acts of the Apostles, on good grounds regarded as of identical authorship with the third Gospel. The Tübingen view of this book stands or falls with the alleged antagonism between Peter and Paul. If there was no antagonism, then there was no need for invention to make Peter appear in his public conduct like Paul. The behaviour ascribed to Peter in the first part of the book, as, for example, in the story of Cornelius, then becomes quite natural and credible. The invention hypothesis is not in keeping with the reliable character of the book at those points in the narrative where we have it in our power to test its accuracy. Dr. Baur and his supporters, indeed, think otherwise, and endeavour to show that the statements of Acts, wherever they can be controlled, are altogether untrustworthy. Their chief instance is the narrative of the council at Jerusalem in Acts xv., which is declared to be utterly irreconcilable with Paul's statements in Galatians ii. Now we do not affirm that the harmonising of the two accounts presents no difficulties, but we do assert that there are no such differences as justify the position that the author of Acts has falsified history to present an aspect of agreement between the Eleven and Paul, which was not real. The historian speaks of a public meeting; the apostle of a private conference. It is intrinsically probable that there

Acts xv. and Galatians ii.

were both in connection with a matter of grave importance; that neither writer should mention both is not surprising; that the historian should refer to the public meeting, and the apostle to the private conference, with whose proceedings only those present were conversant, and on whose proceedings his purpose in writing led him to lay special stress, was most natural. The historian knows of no difference of opinion between the Eleven and Paul; on the contrary, he represents Peter and James as taking the lead in bringing the meeting to adopt a resolution favourable to Gentile liberties. Paul says, that, after he had explained his view of the Gospel to the Eleven, or the leading men among them, they "added nothing" to him, that is, gave no additional instructions, did not treat his Gospel as defective and requiring supplement. They might have had their anxieties before conference, making explanations necessary; but the explanations given, Paul informs us, were deemed quite satisfactory. In view of these facts the verdict of Reuss seems thoroughly justified:

The accounts harmonized.

The judgment of Reuss.

> "The author of the *Acts* merits not the reproach of having altered the facts to make them speak in favour of his view, but gliding more lightly over the opposition Paul encountered at Jerusalem, his aim was to insist more upon the result obtained; while Paul, pre-occupied with the need of raising the question to the height of principles, is led to insist more on the efforts required to vindicate principles."[1]

[1] *Theologie Chrêtienne*, vol. ii., p. 335.

Apologetic theory of the Book.

The apologetic theory of the book, as distinct from the invention hypothesis, is, whether true or false, at all events, quite legitimate. To assimilate, by *selection* of materials, the public conduct of Peter and Paul might conceivably be one aim of the writer. For though there was no radical contrariety between the views of Christianity held by the leaders of the Church, there certainly were two parties in the Church, and we can imagine the author of the *Acts* animated by a praiseworthy desire to make his narrative serve an irenical purpose. At the same time, we do not think that this motive exercised a very decisive influence on the composition of the book. That its author was guided by a particular interest, we have no doubt. In the *Acts of the Apostles*, as in the third Gospel, it is easy to recognise the influence of a desire to show that the Gospel was for mankind, not for Jews only. The writer is, with all his heart, a believer in Pauline universalism; but his interest therein is religious, not controversial. A Gentile himself, he is thankful to know that to the Gentiles God has granted eternal life, and he writes to a friend who shares the same sympathies. Even had there been no difference of opinion between Jewish and Gentile Christians as to the continued obligation of the law, he might have shown a not less lively interest in the great truth that through Christ had come into the world a

True view.

benefit for the whole human race; a religion forming the basis of a new humanity, and destined, in its onward course, to unite men into a holy brotherhood, having one Father in heaven, and one hope of eternal salvation. Surely it does not need the carnality of religious contention to invest such a truth with the power of awakening enthusiasm! Can we not conceive a Gentile Christian familiar with the history of the Apostolic Church, from its first beginnings in Jerusalem to its diffusion throughout Asia and Europe, tracing its steady advance, always keeping in view its ultimate destination as a religion for the whole earth, without having any other end in view than just to tell the thrilling story?

Baur's argument from internal evidence.

In connection with the *Fourth Gospel* we shall only notice very briefly what may be called the chief argument of Dr. Baur against Johannine authorship, based on internal evidence. It is drawn from the *Christology* of this Gospel.

Baur recognizes three types of doctrine.

The view of the person of Christ therein presented is held to be much too developed to be found in any writing emanating from an apostle. Baur recognises three distinct types of doctrine in the New Testament as to the import of Christianity in general, and the person of Christ in particular. The first type is that according to which Christianity is simply Judaism spiritualised, and Jesus the Messiah, Son of God in the Messianic sense, Spiritualised Judaism.

and by His death, founder of a new covenant for the remission of sins. This type is represented by the Synoptic Gospels, and especially by *Matthew.* The second is that in which Christianity stands in opposition to the Law, and Christ is not only the Messiah, but the Lord of the community, object at once of Christian faith and worship, yet nothing more than a man, a man deified, the second Adam, the spiritual, heavenly man. This is the Pauline type of Christology. The third is that in which the opposition between Law and Gospel is lost in a higher unity, and Christ ceases to be a mere man, or even properly a man at all, but as the Logos is identified with the absolute essence of God. This is the type of Christology in the Fourth Gospel, and as the highest and most advanced must, it is held, have come last in the process of evolution. First an *Ebionitic* Christ, then a *Pauline*, then the *pseudo-Johannine*—such is the order; and it is maintained that John the Apostle, like all the eleven, must be conceived as belonging to the earliest Ebionitic stage.

The Pauline type.

The pseudo-Johannine.

We do not admit the accuracy of the above representation, especially as regards the Pauline Christology. But without going into that, two questions may be asked regarding these three types: 1. In what relation do they stand to Christ's own utterances concerning Himself; 2. Assuming a gradual growth in the conception

Two questions respecting these

of Christ's person within the New Testament does the highest stage necessarily carry us beyond the apostolic age?

Christ's utterances concerning His person.

As to the first, the assumption of the Tübingen theorists is that all Christ's own utterances were of the least developed type. On this assumption we remark that it begs the question at issue, which is just this: is Christianity supernatural? is Christ a divine Being? If He be divine, as the Church Universal believes, then, it is quite credible that He uttered such sayings concerning Himself as we find in the fourth Gospel. But, it may be asked, why then are they found only there? The answer may be that the writer of the fourth Gospel had attained to a fuller understanding of Christ's doctrine. We are not entitled to assume that because Jesus taught as high a doctrine concerning Himself as we find in the fourth Gospel, therefore it must have been fully apprehended at the first, or equally apprehended by all who heard Him. It is quite conceivable, that, of those who heard Jesus speak of Himself, now as Son of Man, now as Son of God, some should regard Him mainly on the human side, some mainly on the divine.

The Christology of the Fourth Gospel.

As to the second question—can we conceive Christology assuming the developed form of the fourth Gospel within the apostolic generation?—we make the following observations. Let us assume that all the disciples were alike in their spiritual capacity, and that the difference perceptible in their writings was due to the educating effect of events and of time. Even on that hypothesis it is credible that the fourth Gospel proceeded from the Apostle John. According to the tradition of the early Church, he lived till near the close of the first century, and his Gospel was written later than all the others, and much later than Paul's Epistles. What wonder if we find in a Gospel written at so advanced a period a grasp of the "mystery of godliness," more comprehensive not only than that of the Synoptic Gospels, but even than that of Paul? Coming last the writer would have the benefit of the thoughts of those who went before. As we have seen that the alleged antagonism between Paul and the Eleven is not well founded, we can imagine John perusing with sympathetic spirit the writings of Paul, and receiving powerful stimulus from them. Then, apart from the direct influence of Paul's writings, the indirect effect of Paul's thoughts, current in the Church, must be taken into account as stimulating the evangelist's mind, and leading him to reflect on words of Christ, out of which could be educed a doctrine of Christ's person, higher even than that of Paul. Such an action of the faith of the Church on an individual mind, in quickening recollection and increasing appreciation of the teaching of our Lord concerning Himself, would be

The advantage of St. John.

The influence of Paul's writings and thoughts on John.

only analogous to the known influence of events in bringing the Eleven to a cordial acquiescence in the proposal to admit the Gentiles to fellowship on equal terms. It is, therefore, by no means improbable that the ever-deepening reverence of believers for their Saviour and Lord on the one hand, and the contradictions of unbelief or false belief on the other, led the Apostle John to unfold the full meaning of a title—Son of God, which, at an earlier period, had been allowed to remain in germinal form; to unfold it not by speculative reflection chiefly, but by recording sayings of Jesus uttered in circumstances similar to those of the writer, viz., in presence of the contradictions of unbelief.

How the Apostle may have been led to unfold the meaning of the title—Son of God.

Apostolic growth in the knowledge of Christ.

In these observations we have assumed the possibility of a growing advancement in the knowledge of Christ, even in the case of inspired apostles. There ought to be nothing objectionable in such a supposition to the most devout mind. Paul makes the confession, "now I know in part." All the apostles knew in part, and one might know more than another. The greater limitedness of one apostle's knowledge as compared with another, or of the same apostle's knowledge at one time as compared with another time, does not imply that error must be mixed up with the views of the less informed apostle. It only signifies that the pure light of Truth is broken up into the coloured rays of the prism, under the wise guidance of the Divine Spirit. We can conceive of an apostle who had not entered so fully into the mystery of our Lord's divinity as John, giving a very full lifelike picture of His humanity, without prejudice to His claim to be more than man. This is, in truth, the actual state of the case, as we see when we compare, say, the first Gospel with the fourth. Hints of the higher aspect of Christ's person are not wanting in the former; there is one text in particular of a markedly Johannine character. We refer to Matthew xi. 27: *All things are delivered unto Me of My Father; and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father, neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him.* Still, it is to the Fourth Gospel we must turn for the fully developed doctrine of our Lord's divinity. The Christ of Matthew is pre-eminently *the Son of Man;* the Christ of John is pre-eminently *the Son of God.*

The fully developed doctrine of our Lord's divinity in John.

Dates of the Gospels.

A word may here be said on the dates of the Gospels. The whole tendency of recent investigation has been to press these much further back than the position assigned to them by Dr. Baur. According to him the approximate dates are, of Matthew 130, of Luke 150, of Mark 150–160, of John 160–170. Competent judges of all schools now incline to place the Fourth Gospel at least as far back as the beginning of the second century, and to assign to the Synoptical Gospels a considerably earlier origin.[1] It has been shown, from the very corrupt condition of the texts about the middle of the second century, that the Gospels must have been in circulation long before the time at which they are supposed by Dr. Baur to have come into existence. In connection with this line of argument, important service has been rendered by Dr. Sanday, in his excellent work on *The Gospels in the Second Century*, written in reply to *Supernatural Religion*. The effect of his book is to demonstrate, by means of textual criticism, that the Tübingen account of the origin of the Gospel cannot be true, and that the Tübingen construction of early Church history is a castle in the air. Other writers have done good service in the same line, among whom may be specially mentioned *Zahn*. In a work recently published on the *Diatessaron* of Tatian, this scholar, by a similar process of reasoning, arrives at the same conclusion as Dr. Sanday. Tatian's *Diatessaron* was a continuous narrative of our Lord's life constructed by selection from all the Gospels, John being specially drawn upon.[2] This fact has been ascer-

Dr. Sanday's reply to *Supernatural Religion*

Tatian's *Diatessaron*.

---

[1] It is impossible to give the exact dates of the Gospels. The main point is that they belong to the apostolic age. The Synoptic Gospels were, according to all probability, not later than between 60 and 70 A.D. The probable date of the Fourth Gospel is between 80 and 90 A.D.

[2] Zahn, *Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons.* Theil I., p. 247.

tained by the help of a commentary, written on Tatian's book by the ancient Father Ephraem the Syrian, which has been recently discovered and made the subject of learned study. Careful examination of Ephraem's work discloses the fact that the texts of the Gospel used by Tatian must have been in a very corrupt state, and the bearing of the fact on the question as to the dates of the Gospels is thus indicated by Zahn:

Zahn's opinion as to date of the Gospels.

> "Therefrom follows, in the first place, that between the autographs of the Evangelists, on the one hand, and those manuscripts which, at latest between 160 and 170, the author of the Syriac version in the East, and the author of the old Latin version in the West, and their Greek contemporaries, had in their hands, on the other, lay a history of the spread, emendation, and corruption of the Gospel texts covering a decade; so that in view of the history of the text opinions as to the origin of John's Gospel, such as Baur has expressed, must appear simply as madness. It follows further, that the element which remains the same in all copies of the originals and of the versions, amid all the variations that crept into the text between 150 and 160, must have been everywhere read at the beginning of the second century."

Summing up.

To sum up, the points of our criticism are these:

1. The theory is the application of a philosophical system to Christianity with a foregone conclusion.

2. The exegetical basis of the theory does not stand examination.

3. The criticism of New Testament books associated with the theory, has in most cases failed to commend itself to the approval of impartial investigators.

4. The doctrine of "tendency" has been carried to extravagant lengths.

5. Many of the phenomena in the New Testament on which this doctrine rests are imaginary; and those which are not are for the most part susceptible of a simple explanation. Thus Luke's undoubted interest in Paulinism, or in a Gentile Christianity, is religious, not controversial.

Conclusion.

Let us not conclude this critical estimate without acknowledging that good has come out of the promulgation of this famous theory. It has done service even by the thorough-going nature of its arguments and conclusions, which makes it an extreme example of the "rigour and vigour" characteristic of German theories in general. It is always something to be thankful for, when in any department of human knowledge, a hypothesis is adequately stated, defended, and worked out. If it turn out an error, it is an error to which full justice has been done, and which may be finally put aside. Then we have to thank Dr. Baur for provoking by his theory an immense amount of inquiry among the learned in connection with questions of vital moment, bearing on the origin of Christianity; inquiry which in many ways has been fruitful of valuable results. As Hume's scepticism awoke Kant out of dogmatic slumber, and thus indirectly gave birth to the *Criticism of Pure Reason*, a contribution of permanent value to the theory of

The effect of Baur's theory on the Church.

knowledge; so Baur's theory has roused the Christian Church to consider with increased carefulness the historical foundations of its faith, with the result, not of clearing away all difficulties, but certainly of adding to the strength of Christian conviction, and greatly narrowing the sphere of controversy. Once more, Dr. Baur, in advocating his peculiar views, incidentally directs attention to many Biblical phenomena of interest which had previously been overlooked, and which cast a fresh light on the books wherein they occur. The remark applies especially to the Gospel of Luke.

The Pauline character of Luke's Gospel has been more clearly seen.

Since the Tübingen theory was propounded, students of Scripture have seen, as they never saw before, the Pauline stamp on every page of that Gospel. For the accentuation of that one fact, both pulpit and pew owe a debt to the German theologian whose speculations have occupied our attention. For nothing is more fitted to make this Gospel a copious spring of grace, life, and salvation to the people, than that our preachers should perceive how thoroughly it is pervaded by Paul's

The Gospel of the sinful.

spirit, and how truly it is, as Renan has said, "the Gospel of the sinful."

This Tract may fitly end with the statement of another truth which we have not learned from Dr.

The burden of the whole New Testament.

Baur. It is that the burden of the Third Gospel is the burden of the whole New Testament. These sacred writings are not a heap of confusion and contradiction; on the contrary, amidst much that is distinctive, there is throughout essential harmony. They owe their origin severally to the needs and conflicts of the primitive Church, or particular sections of it, but the whole of the collection has one theme, God's gift of grace in Christ Jesus. All the writers are deeply impressed with the conviction that with Christ a great good came into the world, and that his advent was an epoch-making event in the history of mankind. All regard that event as one in which all men have an interest, "good tidings of great joy," not for Jews only, but also for Gentiles. And the boon Christ brings, as conceived by all alike, is radically the same; reconciliation, peace on earth, between God and man, and between man and man. God as a gracious Father, receiving sinful unworthy men as His children, and men once alienated regarding each other as brethren. The benefit is indeed apprehended and exhibited under different aspects, not conflicting, but rather complementary, and tending, when combined, to show the riches of divine grace. In the Synoptical Gospels, it appears under the title of the kingdom of God or the kingdom of heaven, in accordance with our Lord's frequent though not exclusive mode of representation. In Paul's Epistles, and especially in the four great Epistles to the Roman, Corinthian, and Galatian Churches, the gift of grace is named *the righteous-*

The harmony of the Sacred writings.

Their one theme.

God as Father, men as brethren.

The Kingdom of God.

The righteousness of God in Paul's Epistles.

ness of God, and aptly sets the gospel in contrast to legalism; the gospel offering the righteousness of God as a gift to faith, while legalism has for its aim a righteousness self-acquired. In the Epistle to the Hebrews, the nature of Christianity is further illustrated by being viewed in relation to the Levitical religion. In this aspect, it is the religion of *unrestricted access to God*, in contrast to the Levitical system which kept men at a distance; the religion of "the better hope through which we draw nigh to God." Lastly, in John's Gospel, the gift of God is chiefly set forth as *eternal life*, conferred on all who receive Jesus as the Son of God. "He that hath the Son hath life," is the characteristic message of the fourth Evangelist. All the other writings of the New Testament are in full sympathy with the views set forth in those just named. Peter, James, and the John of the Apocalypse speak the same language as Paul and the four Evangelists. John, in his Gospel, writes: "the law was given by Moses, grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." This saying might be prefixed as a motto to the whole New Testament.

Christianity in contrast to the Levitical religion.

The gift of God as eternal life.

The motto to this whole New Testament.

MAN

PHYSIOLOGICALLY CONSIDERED

BY

ALEXANDER MACALISTER, M.A., M.D., F.R.S.

Summary of the Tract.

I. Man a cosmopolite in geographical distribution, although wanting in those qualifications by virtue of which the most widely diffused animals spread themselves. He has the power of using means to extend and supplement his physical powers. Man's mental power is correlated with the development of his nervous system, although we cannot explain the mental results as due to molecular changes.

II. Man's body is a machine formed for doing work. Its framework is the most suitable that could be devised in material, structure, and arrangement. The muscles, or active organs of motion, considered in reference to their structure, adaptation, and dynamical relations. The working power of the human body. Relation of food to work. The human and the artificial machine compared.

III. The heart a muscular mechanism. Amount of work done by it ;—its complexity, its susceptibility to emotional influences. The blood ; some of its functions.

IV. Speech—produced by correlated muscular mechanisms. Voice and Speech, their respective natures and organs. Vowels and consonants. How dialects arise ; correlation and co-ordination required for speech.

V. Law of cycle in human life. Sleep. Changes which take place during its occurrence. Death.

VI. The Body a Temple of God. Its chief lesson, that of perfect adaptation. His body is a monument of design. The fitting of means to ends an evidence of the wisdom of God. Revelation teaches us that a glorious future awaits redeemed humanity.

Man, Physiologically Considered.

I.

Man cosmopolitan in distribution

The dry land area of the earth's surface is estimated as exceeding fifty-two millions of square miles in extent. Although the different parts of this area present conditions the most varied, and every conceivable range of climate, from perpetual snow to permanent tropical summer; yet, excepting in a few inhospitable tracts within the Polar circles, and a few desert patches elsewhere, man has attained to a universal distribution. The parts uninhabited by man make up less than one tenth of the whole surface.

All other animals restricted to a limited area.

This is a phenomenon unique in the Animal Kingdom; the bounds of habitation of each animal are determined by the existence of those conditions of food and temperature under which its life is possible; and, generally speaking, the area of distribution of each species is very restricted A few animals, like the mouse rat, and dog, have been transported by man over wide areas in comparatively recent times, and are now multiplying in regions in which they were unknown before; but man is the only animal that, by his own exertions and capacities, has traversed the natural barriers which have limited the distribution of other forms.

The most widely diffused animals have certain characters, wanting in man.

Those other animals which, like the rat, have now spread over large tracts of the globe, are characterised by an early maturity, a capacity of feeding upon almost any form of food, and a rapid rate of multiplication. Man presents us with characters in all respects the most diverse from these:—he has the longest period of helpless infancy of any animal, and is slow in attaining maturity (one fourth of his life, at least twenty years, having passed before his full growth is perfected); he is also able to use only a limited number of substances in their natural conditions as food. Mankind also multiplies at a slow rate, thus, while within the past fifty years, forty-five persons have descended from a single pair of royal parents in Britain; in the same period of time one pair of rats would, at their ordinary rate of increase, have had a progeny at least as great, numerically, as the whole population of England. Yet, in the face of all these disabilities, man has, by his own exertions, become a cosmopolite.

Those animals which, zoologically, are the most nearly allied to man in structure have exceedingly narrow areas of distribution. The gorilla is confined to a small tract of West Africa about the size of France. The Chimpanzee, although ranging over a larger district of Equatorial Africa, yet does not extend beyond the region limited by the parallels of 12° N. and S. latitudes, and in this belt is only found between the sea-coast on the west and the meridian of Lake Tanganyika on the east. The Orang Utan is limited to the Islands of Sumatra and Borneo. It seems strange that man should have such a universal diffusion, while these are so restricted and so strictly Equatorial.

Man's nearest allies in structure limited in distribution.

Did we only know concerning man as we know of these anthropoid apes, from preserved museum specimens, we could hardly fail to consider him as eminently unfit for a wide distribution, or for maintaining his position in the struggle for life. Bare in surface, while his neighbours are hair-clad, feeble in teeth, while his nearest allies are strong, with thin flat nails in place of claws, and short, weak hands and arms, incapable of grasping with his feet, imperfect as a climber, less fleet of foot than his foes, nature has neither furnished him with weapons for war, nor with implements wherewith to search efficiently for food; yet this bare, weaponless animal has spread over the whole world, has assumed and maintained dominion over

Man apparently unfit for a wide distribution.

the other creatures, has waged successful warfare against animals fiercer, and against forces stronger than himself, and has exterminated many of the foes which were the most hostile to him.

Man's capability of living in all countries due to his power of usingmeans.

The secret of this capacity for adaptation and dominance lies in Man's power of employing means. By the use of clothing he is able to fit himself to live in any climate; by cooking, to use all varieties of food; by the invention of weapons, to engage in all warfare; and by the perfecting of speech he obtains the power of perfect co-operation with his fellows. The most intelligent animal, untaught by man, can do no more than turn to some obvious use the tree-branch or stone which first comes to hand; but the rudest races of savage man, in the most inhospitable districts, have sought out materials wherewith to make clothing, if they need it; have invented weapons; have brought under subjection the powers of nature, using fire to prepare their food, and the winds to waft them across the waters; and the members of every tribe have framed their own articulate speech for the mutual interchange of thought.

The correlation of bodily to mental organization.

While it is thus power of mind, not power of body, which gives to man his supremacy, yet, in all respects, man's bodily organization is fitted to enable him to use to the best advantage his mental endowments. If he conceive in his mind the plan of making a weapon, his prehensile hand with its sensitive skin and its independently moving and opposable thumb can fabricate it. His sinuous backbone and completely extensile lower limbs enable him to stand upright with perfect stability, with an ease and perfection competent to no other animal; and thus his fore-limbs, relieved from all necessity to act as organs of progression, are perfectly disengaged for work and warfare.

The brain, the instrument of the mind.

The material instrument whereby the mind operates in man, and through which it rules over his whole body, is the nervous system, the central parts of which form that continuous series of organs which are called the brain and spinal marrow. The former of these, the brain, fills the entire cavity of the skull, and is proportionally larger in Man than in any other animal; while the brain of the Gorilla, the highest of the apes, averages 24 ounces in weight, or a little less than $\frac{1}{120}$ of the entire weight of his body, that of man averages 46 oz. or a little more than $\frac{1}{56}$ of his total weight. In minute structure this organ consists of aggregations of very minute branched particles of a peculiar and very decomposable material, which are called nerve-cells, and which vary from $\frac{1}{400}$ to $\frac{1}{8800}$ of an inch in diameter. From each of these minute pyramidal, spindle-shaped, or irregular nerve-cells, there pass two or more very fine tails or filaments, some of which

Its minute structure.

go to communicate with neighbouring cells, while others, of great length, pass through and out of the brain, and are distributed throughout the body; so widely, indeed, do these filaments wander, and so universally are they dispersed, that one cannot touch any area of skin with the point of a needle without pressing on the termination of a nerve fibre. These fibres of distribution, as we may call the long, tail-like threads from the nerve cells are each enclosed in a delicate sheath, and vary from $\frac{1}{500}$ to $\frac{1}{12000}$ of an inch in diameter. These leave the brain in bundles which are called nerves, and are distributed through the body so generally that there is not a structure in the body which is not connected with some single cell or group of nerve-cells in the brain. We may look upon the brain, therefore, with its five million constituent nerve-cells as the great unifying organ among the constituents of the body.

A great part of the brain connected with movement.

Much of the substance of the brain is directly concerned with the superintendence of the machinery of the bodily movements; when we discount this element, which constitutes nearly one half of the human and about three-fourths of the ape's brain, the disproportion between the remainder of the human and of the animal brain appears much greater. Another large contingent of the brain substance is required for the physical processes connected with the reception of impressions from

A great part of the brain connected with the recognition of sensations.

without. We live in a world of vibrations, our surface is constantly coming in contact with the surrounding material bodies either at rest or in motion; while the waves of sound, and those even more problematical vibrations which we call light-waves, are constantly being brought to bear upon us from without. The conditions under which we live render it necessary for our well-being to take cognizance of these vibrations, as by them we learn of our surroundings, and are taught to avoid danger and to procure food.

The extension of each nervous element.

We have seen that every spot on our surface is connected by fine nerve threads with the nervous centres, and that these threads are themselves fine processes of the minute nerve cells, and of the same impressionable material. These threads are not like simple telegraph wires, carrying impulses to a registering machine, they are outgrowths of the registering machine itself, each capable of receiving and feeling an impulse from without at its termination: hence sensation, that is, the affecting of these extremities by external stimulus is registered at the spot where the impression is made. There are two distinct though associated processes connected with sensation, the reception and registration of the impulse, and our consciousness of it: the former occurs in the part itself, the latter in the brain. I am conscious of an impression by virtue of the connection between the local nerve and the groups of brain cells connected therewith; but I feel the contact at my finger-tip, not at my brain. If I cut the connection between the local nerve and the brain, the consciousness of contact is lost, although the local effects are the same as before. If the nerve coming from the surface of a limb communicate through nerve cells in the spinal marrow with a nerve going to a muscle, and if the brain communication be cut by accident or disease, then irritation of the surface will cause the muscle to move, but without any consciousness.

Purpose discernible in nerve actions.

The element of purpose which is discernible in this instance, pervades the action of the entire nervous system in all animals; here the muscle, by contracting, draws the irritated limb away from the irritant without the operation of a conscious will. If, in a recently killed and decapitated frog, a drop of acid be allowed to fall upon the skin, the leg moves and endeavours to wipe it off; but the purpose in such case is unintelligent, not being under the dominion of consciousness, thus if a snake, killed by beheading, be hung up and touched in several places with a stick, it will coil round it; but if for a stick a hot poker be substituted, it will coil round it with equal readiness.

Disproportion between magnitude of stimulus and effect produced.

In many of these actions of the nervous system we notice a singular disproportion between the magnitude of the stimulus and the effect produced. The contact of a fine hair or of a crumb with the mucous surface of the glottis, or throat-opening of the windpipe, will cause a violent spasmodic fit of coughing, which convulses the whole body; while even a more powerful stimulus to other parts of the mouth, the tongue, or throat, organs in other respects equally sensitive, produces no other effect than a flow of saliva or an impulse to swallow. These again are simple illustrations of the element of purpose in nervous actions, as it is of vital importance to the organism that the glottis be kept clear of all solid matter.

The nature of the changes in nerve-tissue during action.

We can learn much of the local change which occurs in nerve-tissue when exposed to contact or stimulation: it is an impulse propagated in the material of the filament from the peripheral termination to the nerve cell, at a definite rate, a little over 100 feet in the second, and associated therewith are certain recognizable physical molecular changes. But of the real nature of the processes whereby this impulse is translated into consciousness, even in its lowest form, we know almost nothing, and still less do we know of the physical processes which underlie or accompany those mental operations, which originate in and work by the agency of the brain, such as thought, emotion, volition. That certain physical changes take place in the cells of the nerve-centres in connection with these processes is evidenced in many ways: energy is dissipated as heat, the blood vessels of the head

Evidence of physical change in the cells of the nervous centres.

and neck show increased pulsation and fulness, the quantity of blood in the other parts of the body is proportionately diminished during brain work, and in direct ratio of the difficulty of the work, and the blood returning from an acting brain is richer in carbonic acid and other products of waste, thereby indicating the consumption of tissue in the work; but the amount of these actual changes is far too slight, and the actual energy which can be shown to be set free is too small to be adequately measured in terms of other forces, although the consequences dependent on the mental exertion may be of tremendous moment. The physical change in the cell may vary in degree, but we have no evidence whatever that it varies in kind; though the mental state may be intellectual labour, emotion, will, or the merest supervision of bodily menial work, we can in all cases only obtain evidence of the combustion and oxidation of the nerve matter, associated with the dissipation of energy as heat and electric force. When intellectual operations are looked at from the physiological side, the difficulties of regarding them as solely the outcome of physical changes in nerve cells are insurmountable. To refer the *Principia* of Newton, the *Iliad* of Homer, or the *Essays* of Bacon to vibrations due to chemical change in a few ounces of nerve cells seems a *reductio ad absurdum* indeed.

Molecular changes cannot account for the mental results.

But while the physical factors in mental processes seem thus utterly inadequate to account for the nature and magnitude of the results, yet they have certain definite relations thereto. The rate of mental action has been carefully studied and ascertained, more especially in its bearing upon the making of exact observations in astronomy, so that the phrase "quick as thought" has a definite meaning, capable of translation into units of time. The amount of tissue-change in the brain during action, although not determined, has been roughly approximated, and will probably before long be more definitely measured, and the amount of energy set free in the course of the physical changes which accompany mental processes may yet be capable of expression in foot-pound equivalents.

Molecular and mental forces co-operate

The mental rules the material in man.

Man alone has the singular pre-eminence of being the animal in which the mental part rules or can rule the material: he alone can turn his mind in upon itself for self-study, he alone has the power of making the reception and recognition of impressions from without subservient to his pleasure in a manner quite unknown to other animals. They can recognize the vibrations of sound-waves, and learn therefrom the presence of other animals, or of noise-producing forces. Man perceives these sounds, classifies them, discerns certain relationships, and makes such combinations of them as minister to his pleasure, and thus invents and improves the art of music, and the instruments by which these pleasing combinations of sound are produced. The lowest races of man have their drums, reeds, and pipes for this purpose, and at a very early stage in the history of humanity we read of Jubal "the father of all such as handle the harp and pipe."[1]

Even the earliest men of whom we have traces had the same kind of mental power of Art which we now possess.

Animals can in like manner recognize sensations of form and colour, and thereby learn something of their surroundings. Man, appreciating these in a higher degree, can reproduce them not only mentally in his memory, but pictorially, by the aid of his hands directed by brain and eye; and so can render permanent those combinations of light, shade, and colouring which gave him pleasure; and he can gratify his taste by art, in places and at times when nature fails to minister pleasant scenes to the eye. And man has done so from an early if not from the earliest times of his existence. The rude savage who hunted the wild ox, mammoth, and reindeer in prehistoric times on the plains of France, has left behind him, scored upon bones, horns, and tusks, life-like graphic outlines of his wild-beast contemporaries.

---

[1] Genesis iv. 21.

II.

The human body viewed as a machine for doing work.

Among the different aspects in which we may regard the living human body, one of the most suggestive and instructive, although perhaps, from its very attractiveness, one of the most commonplace, is in its character as a machine constructed for doing work. In man himself, as in those mechanisms which he constructs by his art, there is no creation of energy; but as in these, the human apparatus transforms into heat and motion the energy of chemical combination which it finds in the materials taken in as food.

The details of the mechanism of man are so complex that it requires a life-long study to obtain a thorough knowledge of his organization; and the more carefully it is examined, the more forcibly do we recognize how completely every part, even the most minute, bears the stamp of perfect fitness for its place and use. We might illustrate this from any subdivision of the parts of the body, but will only refer to two systems, the bones and the muscles.

Suitability of the framework of the machine.

The adaptation of the skeleton to fulfil its function as the firm basis of the body is shewn, firstly, in the suitability of the material of which it is constructed, bone; secondly, in the appropriateness of the disposition of this material both in its minute and its larger organization. There is not one of the two hundred bones which make up the skeleton whose particles are not so perfectly adjusted as in the most efficient manner to sustain the pressure and bear the strain to which it is exposed.

Conditions which a perfect skeleton should fulfil.

In order to build a skeleton of the most suitable kind, the conditions which require to be fulfilled are, first, the component material must be of adequate hardness, toughness, and elasticity; second, it must present an adequate extent of surface to allow of the attachment to it of muscles; and third, it must have as little weight as possible. All these conditions are fulfilled by bone.

Suitability of bone for the purposes of the skeleton.

In the first of these respects, bone is of all available substances the most suitable. Its power of bearing weight without being crushed is greater than that of any other organized tissue, or even than that of many metals. This can be seen from the following table, in which the numbers represent the number of kilogrammes which are required to crush a rod of the substance measuring one square millimetre in area of section.

Table showing relative capacities of resisting crushing.

Steel ...	145	Lead ...	5
Wrought Iron	22	Granite ...	5·9
Cast Iron ...	73	Bone ...	15
Oak	4·8		

The elasticity of bone is also one of its most characteristic qualities, as can be seen from the following table which gives the values of the modulus of elasticity of different substances.[1]

Table showing the relative elasticities of various bodies.

Steel	21,000.
Wrought Iron	19,000.
Bone	2,400.
Lead	1,800.
Oak, if parallel to the grain ...	1,100.
Oak, across the grain	130.

Lastly, the tensile strain which bone can bear without giving way is also very great; from numerous experiments the following tearing limits have been determined for different substances, the numbers, as before, representing the number of kilogrammes required to tear a rod of the size mentioned above:—

Table showing power of resisting tearing of various bodies.

Steel ...	102	Bone ...	12
Wrought Iron	41	Zinc ...	5
Cast Iron ...	13	Oak ...	6½

A cube of bone one square inch in surface will bear, without being crushed, a weight of more than four tons; and the weight of the whole human

---

[1] The method whereby these values are ascertained will be found in any work on elementary Physics. As the co-efficient of elasticity, that is, the proportional amount by which a rod of any substance one square millimetre in cross section is lengthened by the load of one kilogramme, is a very small fraction, the relative elasticities can be more graphically represented by the reciprocal of this fraction, *i.e.*, unity divided by the proportion of elongation, which represents the theoretic weight in kilogrammes which would be required to lengthen a bar to twice its original length, if it were perfectly elastic. This is called the modulus of elasticity.

Lightness and strength of human skeleton.

skeleton is distinctly less than the weight of a similar framework of wrought iron of equal strength. There are few better illustrations of the hardness and strength of the human skeleton than the comparative rarity of broken bones, considering the amount of violence to which the human frame is from time to time subjected.[1]

Extent of bony surface provided for attachment of muscles.

In the second place, the ordinary male human skeleton exposes a surface a little over one thousand square inches in extent, available for muscular attachments; more than double the area which a wrought iron skeleton of the same height and weight, and constructed in proportion so as to be of the greatest possible strength, would present.

Weight of human bones.

The weight of the average male skeleton when fresh and moist is about twenty pounds, when dry and prepared, about ten pounds, and the material of which it is made up is in specific gravity one quarter that of wrought iron.[2] Not only is the substance thus comparatively light in itself, but it is disposed so as to offer the maximum of resistance with the use of the minimum of material.

Those bones which are constructed to support

---

[1] A comparison of these tables shows that bone is equally strong to resist crushing and tearing, in the former respect being little inferior to wrought iron, in the latter to cast iron.

[2] The following table of the specific gravities of the substances above contrasted will be of interest:

Wrought Iron...	7,788	Marble... ..	2,837
Cast Iron ...	7,207	Bone	1,870
Lead	11,352	Oak	0,845

Architecture of bones, hollow columns.

Cancellated or spongy tissue in ends of long bones.

weight are built as hollow columns; and in these the proportion of the thickness of the solid wall to the whole diameter is the best possible for strength and lightness.[1] These hollow cylinders are still further strengthened by pilaster-like ridges along the lines of greatest pressure, and by struts under the piers of arches. Where the ends of bones come in contact with each other so as to form moveable joints, they are expanded so as to afford large and often interlocking surfaces, combining thus stability with the capability of motion. The shaft of the bone alters in structure as it thus expands;

---

[1] It has been found by experiment that if the *same amount of material* be used to construct two columns, one solid and the other hollow, that the following numbers will represent their respective powers of bearing vertical weight on the end, and a transverse breaking strain :—

		Crushing Limit.	Snapping Limit.
1. Solid column, diameter	100	1,000	10
2. Hollow column, diameter	125	2,125	17

(Thickness of ring in No. 2=50, therefore solid diameter equal to that of No. 1).

If now we take three columns *of the same diameter*, but constructed of varying amounts of material, and compare these in the same respects :—

	Crushing Limit.	Snapping Limit.
1. Diameter, 100, solid column	1,000	8
2. Diameter, 100, hollow column, with inner diameter 60...	870	7
3. Diameter, 100, hollow column, with inner diameter of 80	590	4·8

This table shows us that, although No. 2 has only three-fifths the amount of bone of No. 1, yet it is seven-eighths as strong; and No. 3 has only one-third the substance and more than one-half the strength of No. 1.

and instead of continuing hollow to its articular or joint-forming end, which would diminish its strength, the hitherto compact bone becomes split up into a large series of closely applied thin plates of bone, which are so disposed that they bear upon their ends the direct pressure of the body. These lamellæ are tied together by numerous intersecting plates placed at right angles to them, and these secondary lamellæ serve as ties to prevent the separation of the primary system. By this arrangement the articular end of the bone becomes expanded and formed of cancellous or spongy bony tissue, the structure of which at first sight seems so confused and irregular, but displays on closer examination an elaborate plan in the disposition of its every plate. As the conditions under which each bone is placed vary, so the plan of the lamellæ varies; but the general principle holds good all through, that the layers are placed to resist respectively pressure and tension. The arrangement is consequently so characteristic in every bone, that an anatomist of experience can at once recognize from what bone and in what plane any given section is taken.

Architecture of spongy bony tissue.

Arrangement of cancelli in each bone peculiar to suit its special conditions.

The same fitness in the dynamics of the skeleton.

If, from the statics, we turn to the dynamics of the skeleton, the same fitness is observed: the adaptations of the long bones as levers for so many purposes; the mechanism whereby the sinuously curved spine can be kept erect in different positions; the arrangements whereby bipedal progression can take place, and by which standing on two feet can be accomplished with perfect maintenance of stability; the mechanism whereby without the constant action of the straightening muscles of the knee, but simply by the influence of the superincumbent weight causing certain bony surfaces to glide on each other, a perfect ligamentous interlocking occurs in the knee joints, enabling the thighs to continue vertical in standing, without the fatigue of continued muscular work, all these and many more examples could be adduced as interesting studies in the teleology of the skeleton.

The muscles the active organs of bodily work.

But the bones constitute only the passive organs of motion, the muscular system is the real seat of the working power of the body; to it the bones are subordinated, and in this system we are still more strikingly presented with evidences of design.

Number of muscles and amount of muscular tissue in man.

There are about two hundred and sixty pairs of muscles attached to the bones in man, and serving the purpose of moving these as levers in the different ways required for the purposes of life. These constitute upwards of sixty pounds of the weight of the body; but as this includes the weight of the sinews and non-contractile fibrous expansions which ensheath the muscles, not more than forty-eight pounds of this represents truly contractile material.

The contractile substance of muscle.

The substance of which these muscles consist is probably the most remarkable material in the body, and it is worthy of note that although it is a substance easily obtained and presenting no apparent difficulty in preparation and examination; and although anatomists have brought to bear upon it all the improved instruments of modern science, and have used these with all the skill of years of practical experience, yet we have not succeeded in learning the details of its structure. Minute examination has only revealed that the elements which were once regarded as ultimate are compound, and organized with a minuteness which has as yet baffled the highest powers of the microscope to unravel.

Properties of muscular substance.

The most remarkable property of muscle is its contractility. The particles of which it is composed can, upon being bidden, change their place, so as to alter the shape of the whole mass, shortening and thickening it. Most of the muscles of the body are attached to bones at their two extremities; and when this change in shape takes place, the two bony attachments are forcibly approximated. Of these, one attachment is to a fixed bone, the other to one that is moveable; and consequently the force of the contraction is expended in drawing the latter, or insertion of the muscle towards the origin or attachment to the fixed bone. Thus the principal muscle which operates in bending the elbow joint, and which occupies the front of the arm from the shoulder to the elbow, arises by two strong sinewy cords from the shoulder-blade bone; hence it is called *biceps, i.e.*, two-headed, and it is inserted into the outer of the two bones of the fore-arm.

Every muscle adapted for the work it is required to do.

The study of the statics of the muscular system is teeming with interest. There is not an individual muscle which does not show the most perfect adaptation possible for the work it has to do: in its attachments, its proportional size, in the spot wherein it is entered by the blood-vessels which nourish it, and by the nerve which connects it with the brain, or centre of volition.

Force of muscular contraction.

The force with which a muscle contracts is very great, and has been determined by experiment to be proportional to the area of the cross section of the muscle. The contraction of a muscle whose sectional area is one square inch can support a weight of a little over 100 lbs. The distance through which the muscle, in contraction, draws its insertion is proportional to the length of the muscular fibre-bundles; thus, in the case of the *biceps*, the muscle which bends the elbow, already referred to, in an arm of average size, its area of section is one and three quarter square inches, and its bundles of fibres are six to eight inches in length. It has, therefore, contractile material sufficient to raise a weight of 175 lbs, through a space of four inches. As in the ordinary economy

Some muscles arranged so as to increase speed at the expense of power.

of the body the lifting of such a large weight is not required, the insertion is so disposed on the fore-arm bones as to make these work as a lever of the third order, so that the weight-bearing extremity, or hand, moves through a space six times as great as that through which the insertion absolutely moves.

As the area of cross section of all the muscles of an average human body amounts to over 200 square inches, there is thus in the whole muscular system of the human body a potential energy equal to the amount which would be expended in raising at a single effort a weight of nine tons to the height of one foot. All this force can be set in motion by the human will.

Working power of the body.

From observations which have been made on railway navvies, stevedores, and other men engaged in hard manual labour, it has been ascertained that the amount of muscular work which an average labouring man performs in the day is accomplished at the expenditure of a force equal to that which would be required to raise 350 tons to the height of one foot; that is, allowing ten hours in the working day, the rate of work equals the raising of thirty-five foot-tons per hour. It is, however, possible for an able-bodied labourer to work continuously at a greater rate than this. The highest registered rate of work of piledrivers is equal to the raising of 450 foot-tons *per diem*. By working in spurts a much higher rate of work may be attained for a short time. Each man of the crew of an eight-oared boat works, in a boat-race, at a rate equal to that required for raising a little over four foot-tons per minute, expending thus nearly eight times more energy in the time than is done at the rate of work of the ordinary day labourer.

Energy from the transformation of other forces.

Man's body does not create energy; but as, in a steam engine, the working force is derived from the potential energy of the fuel employed, so in the human body the force of the muscular system is derived from the substances taken in as food. In man, as in the heat-engine, the working force is set free by the occurrence of a process of combustion; and in the body of a healthy man there is consumed daily about half-a-pound of carbon, the equivalent of ten ounces of coal. By the process of combustion, that is, the union of this carbon with the oxygen of the air taken into the lungs in the process of breathing, there is produced an equivalent amount of carbonic acid, which is got rid of by being carried in the venous blood to the lungs and there breathed out. This substance (carbonic acid) is poisonous, and even when a very small percentage of it occurs in the air it produces injurious effects. One man hourly vitiates to the extent of 0.2 per cent. 350 cubic feet of air, and even this small amount of the gaseous products of breathing is unwholesome. Hence the necessity for perfect ventilation, especially in work-rooms,

Waste products of combustion set free by respiration.

where persons are assembled for any form of exertion; and as with increased work there is a commensurately increased exhalation of this deleterious gas, the need of ventilation will increase with the severity of the work.

Relation of food and work.

As carbon is the element of human food whose oxidation sets free energy most conveniently, it becomes important in arranging dietaries for labouring men, that carbon-supplying foods should bulk largely therein. Extensive observations on large masses of labouring men have shown that a healthy adult requires daily about the following quantities of food:—

Diet scale for healthy adult.

Of nitrogenous substances, such as meat	6 oz.
Of fats (butter, etc.)	3 „
Of carbo-hydrates (sugar, starch, etc.)	18 „
Of saline matter, chiefly common salt	1 „
Of water	80 „
Total...	108 oz.

Collateral conditions to be taken into account in choosing food.

In choosing the substances of these different classes as foods, their relative facility of undergoing digestion, preparatory to oxidation, must be taken into account, as well as the absolute amount of oxidizable material. This is true of the heat engine as of the man. Carbon, in the form of diamond or of blacklead (graphite), would form extremely bad fuel for a steam-engine, as these are not easily burned; and similarly, in the food supply of man, we must take into account the facility with which these substances are soluble, and admissible by digestion into the blood, for the purpose of transmission through the body for the nutrition of the tissues, and of undergoing, in the proper place, the oxidation which converts the potential energy of chemical combination into heat and muscular force. The molecules of the contractile stuff in muscle become broken up at each contraction, with the production not only of water and carbonic acid, but also of other substances in smaller quantities. If the blood stream going to and coming from a muscle be cut off, after a very short period of activity, the muscle uses up all its contractile stuff, and becomes unable to continue its contraction, while it becomes loaded with the effete products of the chemical changes. Hence it is necessary for the well-being of the muscle and for its continuance in activity that new material be brought to it to reconstruct its molecules of contractile material; and so into the blood there must be poured continually from the digestive organs a new supply of material available for reconstituting these contractile molecules.

Chemical decomposition takes place in muscle when in action.

Need for constant blood supply to muscle to reconstruct its contractile substance.

A diet of the description given above contains potential energy equal to 3300 foot-tons in a day, of which we have seen that about one-seventh

Amount of energy expended in internal work, heat, etc.

part is the amount available for useful external work; the rest is expended in maintaining heat, the action of the heart, secretion, nervous action, and other departments of internal work. For the purposes of the life of the body, in order that the necessary processes may take place in the protoplasm of its component cells, it is necessary that the temperature should be maintained between 96° and 100° F.; so we find that the normal heat of the human body is maintained at some point from 97° to 99°, being highest during the most active period of work, shortly after breakfast-time, and lowest when tissue-change is lowest at the small hours of the morning, from 1 to 3 a.m.[1] We are not, therefore, to look upon the six-sevenths of the energy as lost, because it does not show as muscular work. But, comparing the living engine with the artificial heat machine, the advantage is distinctly on the side of the former, for in the most perfect of the latter in actual use there is barely one-ninth of the energy supplied by the fuel utilizable for external work.[2]

Contrast of man and the best heat-engine.

[1] The amount of energy expended in the maintenance of the constant temperature of the human body is equal to the amount required to raise 48½ pounds of water from the freezing to the boiling point. If this energy were converted into motion, it would suffice to raise a man of ten stones weight to the height of nine miles in a day.

[2] By the most perfect construction of gas-engine, Crossley has been able to utilise $\frac{1}{5}$ of the energy of the fuel supplied, and Perkins has by special arrangement got nearly the same amount of work with a steam engine, but the best engines in use give only $\frac{1}{9}$th.

III.

The heart a muscular mechanism.

The heart is perhaps the most wonderful of the special mechanisms of the human body. Its ceaseless activity, its sensitiveness in sympathising with the emotions of the mind, and the intricacy of its mechanism, have from the earliest times attracted notice, and caused it to be regarded as the very centre of life itself. To the older physicians of the classic age, who only regarded the brain as a cold mass placed in the head to temper the undue fervency of the heart, all thought, all emotion, all feelings were supposed to have their seat in the heart; and we in our colloquial language have adopted those Orientalisms of expression regarding the heart which have been familiarised and endeared to us by their Biblical use.

Older views of the nature of the heart.

The physical centre of the circulation of the blood.

The modern physiologist has largely robbed the heart of much of the mystery, and much of the psychic association with mind and desire, with which the fancy of our forefathers had clothed it, and has transferred it from its position as seat of the affections, to the no less interesting place of physical centre of the circulation of the blood; but as the regular uninterrupted flow of blood is absolutely essential to the continuance of vitality, it is therefore physically true that out of the heart are "the issues of life."

Description of the heart: Its four chambers.

The human heart is a muscular organ, about ten ounces in weight, which, in order that its regular changes of expansion and contraction may take place with the least possible friction, is enclosed in a smooth bag, the pericardium, whose surface is rendered still more smooth by being moistened with a small quantity of watery fluid. The organ is hollow, and consists of four distinct cavities, one for receiving the impure or venous blood returning from all parts of the body, a second for taking the blood thus collected, and forcibly propelling it into the lungs. These two cavities are on the right side of the heart, and are called respectively the right auricle and the right ventricle. Into the third cavity or left auricle the blood, which has been purified in the lungs, is returned and collected; and from hence it passes into the fourth and last cavity, the left ventricle, which performs the great work of driving the wave of pure blood through the body for its nourishment.

Work done by the heart.

The wonderful energy of the muscular material of which the walls of these cavities is made up is the first and most prominent characteristic which we notice. The left ventricle by its contraction sends at every beat a wave of blood into the arterial system. At least five ounces of blood is expelled at each stroke, with a force capable of raising the jet to a height of about ten feet. As this is performed about seventy-five times in the

Average day's work of the heart.

minute, the daily work of this part of the heart is easily calculated, and in an average male heart amounts to the lifting of a little over one hundred and eighty foot-tons in the day. If we add to this the work done by the other cavities of the heart, we find that the whole amount of cardiac labour in the day reaches the amazing total of two hundred and forty foot-tons, or two-thirds the ordinary labouring force of the whole voluntary muscular system.

Comparison of the work done by the heart with other forms of muscular work.

We can probably realize in the most graphic manner the amount of work expressed by this figure, if we remember that the muscular work done by a man of one hundred and fifty pounds weight, in ascending Snowdon, comes to about the same total. From many experiments in Alpine ascents, we find that when there are no special difficulties in the way an active man can climb ten thousand feet in ten hours; that is, can raise his own weight one thousand feet per hour; but if the amount of work which the heart performs were expended by it in the task of raising its own weight, it would lift itself to the top of the highest peak of the Himalayas in one hour and a quarter. One of the most rapid ascents known to me was one in which a man of one hundred and forty pounds weight ascended to a height of two thousand five hundred feet in the space of thirty-nine minutes; but within that time the heart has done work equal to the lifting of itself a thousand feet above the top of Mont Blanc.

Ceaselessness of heart's action during life.

A second and equally marvellous aspect of the work of the heart is its ceaselessness. Day and night, whether the body sleeps or wakes, year by year it is ever acting. While voluntary muscular work must intermit for periods of rest greater than the periods of work, the heart's rest-periods are, if anything, shorter than its work periods; and as the vessels which nourish the wall of the heart arise from the great artery immediately above the heart, so it is directly pumping blood for its own nutrition at each stroke, and nourishing itself the better when acting the more strongly.

The heart a complicated machine.

The complexity of the action of the heart is another feature worthy of note: while to the hand the stroke of the heart gives the impression of a single beat, and while even to the ear the sound of the heart's beat seems as a double sound, yet, as we have seen, during each single pulsation there is a dilatation and a subsequent contraction of each of the four separate cavities. As the blood on each side passes from the receptive cavity or auricle into the propelling cavity or ventricle, its return is prevented by the closure of a system of valves which are self-acting. Again when each ventricle has contracted and expelled its contained blood into the large arteries, the return of the fluid is prevented by another series of valves. At each action

The action of the valves of the heart.

of the heart, therefore, four sets of valves, consisting of eleven separate curtains, or membranous folds, are brought into play. It was the study of these valves that, in the first instance, led to the discovery of the course of the circulation of the blood.

Susceptible of influence of emotions

The ancient view, which attributed to the heart the origin and control of emotion and thought, was based on the observation that the heart is keenly susceptible to the influence of mental conditions, and is, of all organs, that by the alterations in whose action the emotions are most distinctly shown. Many forms of sensations and mental states, especially those which are pleasurable, or those of fear, accelerate its action; feelings of self-consciousness and shame also excite it; sudden shock or sorrow render the action slower and less efficient, or may even temporarily arrest it, causing syncope or fainting. With these emotional states the whole circulation sympathizes.

Mechanism of blushing

By the action upon the blood-vessels through certain nerves in the neck, mental emotions of self-consciousness or shame cause the muscular walls of the superficial blood vessels of the face and neck to relax, and the face and neck become suffused, producing the phenomenon of blushing. Conversely, with the diminished heart's action of terror, shock or sorrow, unnatural pallor may be produced by the opposite condition of vascular contraction. This close connection of the action of the heart with emotion

Heart in cold-blooded animals acts after death or removal.

through the central nervous system, is characteristic especially of man and the higher warm-blooded animals. It is among these alone that stoppage of the heart and cessation of life are simultaneous; for among the lower forms of cold-blooded animals the heart may continue to beat long after the animal is dead. If in a frog or a tortoise which has been killed by beheading, the heart be taken out from the body, it continues to beat even when placed on a plate; and if cut up into pieces some of the portions continue to act for a considerable time after separation.

Heart not under the influence of the will.

The heart is not under the influence of the will, and cannot be stopped by any voluntary natural act. By modifying the breathing and by position we may indirectly affect it, as in the celebrated case of Colonel Townshend,[1] but it is beyond the control of simple volition. So perfect, however, is the involuntary mechanism which regulates the heart and circulation, that they are continually being modified. From moment to moment, changes are occurring in the different organs, so that the quantity of blood required by each needs a continual adjustment. When food is introduced into the stomach the organ immediately requires, and immediately obtains an increased flow of blood: so the brain, so the muscles when they are in action, demand and receive increased nutrition. A practical deduction from this is plain, that as little exertion as possible should be made during the taking place of the earlier stages of digestion, when an increased flow of blood is required by the organs which secrete the fluids used to dissolve the nutritious parts of the food.

---

[1] Dr. Cheyne, in 1734, describes certain observations made by him upon a certain Colonel Townshend, who professed to have the power of stopping his heart at will; but the case is one of great obscurity and uncertainty, and the evidence that he really possessed the ability so to do is very imperfect and inconclusive.

The blood.

The blood itself deserves a special notice. An everflowing stream is a necessary condition for the maintenance of the life of the brain, and through it of the body,—so in this respect "the blood is the life." The human body contains about twelve pounds weight of this fluid, which owes its red colour to the myriads of little bodies, called red corpuscles, which float in it. These are in such enormous numbers, that they make up about five pounds of the weight of the blood. Each one is flattened like a coin, only biconcave, not plane on its surfaces. Their size is exceedingly minute, for if piled up on each other in a column, like so many pennies, it would take twelve thousand to make a pile one inch in height; and if spread out flat on a plate of glass, closely edge to edge, it would take ten millions of them to pave a square inch of the glass with one layer of them; and yet so many of them are there in the blood of an adult man, that if all

Its quantity and constituents.

The blood corpuscles.

the corpuscles of the blood were thus spread out, they would pave an area of 3000 square yards.

Respiratory function of the red blood-corpuscles.

These minute bodies have a remarkable function. We have seen that during every vital action in the body, a process of combustion or oxidation takes place in the tissues. The air taken into the lungs in the process of breathing contains oxygen, and these little blood-discs absorb this gas, and in them it combines with one of their constituents. They carry this gas to the tissues, part with it where it is wanted, and thus are the agents whereby the real work of respiration is carried on; the products of combustion being returned to the lungs, dissolved in the fluid parts of the blood.

IV.

Speech a human attribute.

The apparatus of speech is one of the most characteristic parts of the human organization; for although the organs which are used for this purpose are common to man and the lower animals, yet in him they have attained to a degree of specialization far beyond that found in any other animal; to none of whom is real articulate speech physically possible, except in the form of the feeble parody artificially induced in speaking birds, such as parrots and ravens.

In making intelligible communications with his fellows, man makes use of noises of two kinds, voice sounds and speech sounds. The first series of these, or voice sounds, are produced in the gristly box, called the *larynx*, which can be felt in the throat below the chin, and to which the familiar name "Adam's apple" is given, from its greater prominence in males than in females. Through this box the air passes, in breathing, from the mouth into the windpipe, on its way to the lungs and back again; and in the middle of this organ, its cavity is narrowed to a long chink or fissure, bounded on each side by a thin, sharp-edged, elastic, membranous fold, projecting inwards as a shelf from the inner wall of the larynx. To these folds the name *vocal cords* is given, and the chink between them is called the fissure of the glottis. In the process of ordinary breathing this chink is wide, so that the column of air can pass through without influencing the vocal cords; but when, by the actions of certain little muscles, the two vocal cords are made to approximate, then the fissure is narrowed to a long and very straight slit; and in this condition, if the air in the lungs be breathed out forcibly, the two sharp edges of the cords are made to vibrate like the reeds of a harmonium, and the column of air contained in the cavity between this and the mouth is affected, and by its vibration produces the audible voice.

Voice and speech distinguished.

The organ of voice

Method whereby voice is produced.

The nature of the sound produced depends on

Physical conditions which modify the vocal sounds.

certain physical factors. Upon the natural length of the cords the variety of voice is dependent: the shrill high treble of the child is due to the short cords in the undeveloped larynx. The soprano of the female depends on her smaller larynx; while the baritone and bass of the male are associated with the greater length of the vocal cords. In the growing boy a sudden change takes place in the size of the larynx about fourteen years of age; and coincidently with the beginning of this accelerated growth, the lining membrane becomes thickened and vascular: hence the note of the voice is suddenly altered, producing the characteristic cracked voice at this period.

Tone, pitch and timbre.

As these vocal cords can have their degree of tension very much varied, so the note produced, which depends on the tension and length of the cords, is liable to vary. The loudness of a sound is due to the amplitude of the vibration, and depends on the force of the out-breathed blast; while the quality depends on the character of the lining membrane, the shape of the throat and mouth cavity, the arching of the palate, the position of the tongue and lips, and the regularity of the teeth.

Voice not peculiarly human.

Voice is not a peculiar attribute of man; indeed, there are few of the higher, air-breathing vertebrates which are quite dumb; and many, like the finches, mocking-bird, and nightingale, have a great range in their singing voice. But man can voluntarily produce a series of sounds far more extensive than those which can be made by any animal, and can vary them in order and combination, in a way and to a degree unexampled elsewhere; but voice is essentially inarticulate, and requires to be modified or supplemented by sounds produced in the mouth before it becomes genuine language.

Speech differs from voice.

How vowels are sounded.

With every fundamental note produced by a musical instrument, or by the vibration of the human vocal cords, there is always associated a harmonic series of higher sounds, which are called *overtones* of the primary note. It can be proved by experiment that, by varying the shape of the cavity through which the sound waves pass from the producing instrument, the relative strength of these can be made to vary, as there is correlated with each of these sets of overtones, a peculiar shape of cavity capable of intensifying it, and of commensurately enfeebling others. If, for example, we elongate as much as possible the cavity which extends from the top of the larynx to the lips, by depressing the former and protruding the latter, and if, at the same time, we narrow the aperture of the protruded mouth, the overtones which become intensified produce the vowel sound which we represent by the letter *u* (*oo*). When the opposite condition is produced, and the cavity

The influence of the shape of the resonator upon the quality of the sound.

shortened as much as possible, with raised tongue, and narrow, transversely slit-like mouth, the vowel sound produced by the intensified overtones is *ee*, while other altered conditions are correlated to the other vowel sounds.

Relation of each vowel sound to a particular note.

Each vowel shape of the mouth is correlated to a specific note, and singers have learned by practice how much easier it is to sing a given vowel on its appropriate note than on any other. This can be experimentally proved by making the mouth cavity into a series of vowel shapes, and holding before the aperture a series of tuning forks sounding feebly. It will then be found that when the appropriate fork is held before the mouth formed into the correlated shape the sound becomes immediately intensified. With the common Jew's harp we can, in like manner, produce almost any vowel sound, by altering the shape of the resonating cavity of the mouth to which it is applied. These experiments show that the *u* sound is produced when the mouth is in the shape which resonates with the tuning-fork of B flat in the bass clef, and the other vowels correspond to other notes. The vowels are thus laryngeal in their production, but are mouth sounds in development. Other elements are, however, required to produce articulate speech.

Experimental proofs.

How consonants are produced.

When, coincidently with the production of vowel sounds, the current of vibrating air traversing the cavity of the mouth is suddenly interrupted, and then renewed, an explosive sound is superadded to, and modifies the vowel sound; these explosives we call consonants, and they vary according to the part of the mouth or throat where the closure takes place. When the interruption takes place by closure of the lips they are labials, as *b* and *p*, but they may be dentals, palatals, or gutturals when produced by contact of the tongue with the teeth, palate or throat. Sometimes the closure is but partial, then the sound is not interrupted but continuously modified. Sounds of this kind are called aspirates and sibilants.

Units of human speech.

By these varying methods the human speech-organs can produce three hundred and seventy distinct sounds, of which at least sixty are vowels, and three hundred and ten are consonants. Of these we use, in English, not more than seventy-six, of which only fifty are of common occurrence.

Some peculiarities of the production of speech sounds.

When we consider the small space occupied by the organs of speech, the small range of motion permissible to each, and the enormous differences in the produced sounds due to very slight variations, the definition and range of the speech sounds is remarkable; and it becomes more interesting when we note how closely the physical conditions of the parts about the mouth are associated with peculiarities of sound, and even with characteristic differences of dialect. The

Physical basis of difference in language.

narrow high palatine arch of most Indo-germanic races is associated with the capacity of sounding the cerebral *r* and cerebral *t*, sounds which are difficult or impossible to be produced by races with wider, flatter palates. Similarly the absence of sibilation in some languages, as in many of those of the South Sea Islands, the replacement of *l* by *r* or the converse, and the use of a prosthetic nasal, noticeable in so many African languages, are likewise explicable by the existence of small variations in physical conformation of the mouths in different races. In this respect Philology is really but a subdivision of applied Anatomy and Physiology.

Marks of design in speech.

But, in another aspect, the correlated conditions which render articulate speech possible, are worthy of consideration as a prominent evidence of design. The differences between the physical processes which produce the specific sounds are slight, and the conditions under which any of these sounds can be produced are narrowly restricted. To an animal with larger jaws and a longer tongue, speech of the human kind would be physically impossible.

The organs of speech only instruments, subservient through the nervous system, to the intelligent mind.

The co-existence of the even curve of the teeth, the short concave vault of the palate, the broad, mobile-tipped tongue, and the comparatively free thin lips, with laryngeal cords possessing a wide range of vocalizing, is necessary to a speaking animal. But, behind all these physical parts of the apparatus, there must be the co-ordinating nervous centres directing the order of movement of all these parts, and above this there must be the mental power of formulation of words, and the capacity of associating definite mental conceptions with separate sounds, which makes the difference between the speech of the intelligent man and the meaningless babble of the idiot.

V.

Law of cycle in human life

In the phenomena of human life there is noticeable a certain regular law of periodicity: the actions of the heart, the rhythm of inspiration and expiration, the morning and evening rise and fall of temperature, the recurring need to take in food, and the regularly required period of sleep, are instances of this tidal ebb and flow of activity. Throughout the whole body, work and rest must alternate, for work means transformation of the living tissue, which must be built up again during rest. The state we call sleep is, for the brain, what rest is for the muscle. During sleep, all volitional work is suspended, and the organs influenced thereby have a rest; the automatic work of the brain is stopped, and consciousness is temporarily obliterated. As the transformations of tissue are much diminished, the heart's beat becomes slackened both in frequency and force, and the respiration also diminishes in depth and rapidity. The

Sleep

Diminished oxidation during sleep.

changes in the tissues are slow, and the waste minimised, so, though nutrition is also lowered, yet repair can now take place with little interruption; and those waste products of cellular activity which have been produced in quantity during the working hours of wakefulness, and which, towards evening, have clogged the living tissues, can now be got rid of, and by passing into the venous blood are removed from the body by the appropriate system of purifying glands.

Practical deduction.

That rest may be enjoyed to the best advantage, there should be as little visceral work as possible going on during sleep: hence, it is desirable that no food should be taken within at least two hours of the period of rest.

Life cycle of the individual.

In the life cycle of the individual, three stages may be distinguished. In the first, nutrition proceeds actively, and repair and growth exceed the waste. Within this period the body increases in size and power; the brain, which at birth is of the capacity of 350 cubic centimetres, grows in two months to the size of 500 cubic centimetres; and by the tenth year is two and a half times larger still; becoming three times this size, or about 1500 cubic centimetres, in the adult.

On attaining to full growth, waste and repair proceed *pari passu* during the middle period of life, and finally in the third stage of the cycle, waste begins to exceed reparation, and the tissues, imperfectly nourished, undergo change, diminution, and degeneration: this is the stage of old age. If there were no disturbing external influences in operation, life would end by a gradual sinking or dissolution; but in the whirl of opposing forces among which we live, some jarring condition is constantly being brought to bear on the organism, whose molecular forces are weakened with advancing waste, and this suddenly interrupts some of the vital processes. If, for example, too little or too impure blood be sent from the heart to the brain, cerebral action is stopped, the nervous centres which superintend circulation and respiration become paralysed, and both these functions become for ever suspended. If, on the other hand, some of the vessels in the brain, with walls degenerated in texture, from want of nutrition, are exposed to an undue strain of increased blood pressure, the coats give way, and effused blood presses on and disorganizes the nervous centres. Some such event interrupts nutrition and causes death, the great change. Before it, the organism was a unity made up of mutually co-operating, integral parts. After death, each organ, each molecule, becomes independent, and undergoes chemical change, which rapidly eventuates in the total disintegration of the whole organism, and the dust returns to the earth as it was, and the spirit returns unto God who gave it.

Death usually not due to simple decay

Death from stoppage of brain's action.

Changes produced in the organism by death.

VI.

The body a temple of God.

"KNOW ye not that your body is a temple of the Holy Ghost;" wrote the Apostle Paul to the Corinthians. He thus indicates what is the highest design of the body of man, and though this temple is, like all things earthly, corruptible, yet it is worthy as a dwelling-place of God. It is a temple excellent in beauty. The sculptor and poet have exerted their highest skill in the representation of it. It is a temple admirable in architecture. Its structure has excited the adoring wonder of the Psalmist. It is choice in material, as we have seen in our foregoing studies. It is a temple whose perfectly organized arrangements for repair can long resist and restore the dilapidations of time and accident; cleansed externally by five million sets of external cleansing glands; ventilated by the most perfect apparatus for the admission and thorough transmission of pure air, and for the removal of the impure; heated by a perfect self-acting system of hot pipes; lit by windows of surpassing complexity; having every part connected with its fellows by an almost instantaneous system of communication, which centres in the shrine of the temple, the seat of the conscious mind; and if those temples which we see round about us are not thus

Its beauty.

Its fitness.

Its organized arrangements.

perfect in all particulars, it is because they have been defiled and neglected, turned to base purposes, and degraded from the high calling to which they should have been consecrated.

Lesson from study of human structure.

The prominent lesson which the examination of the human body impresses on us is that of perfect adaptation of means to ends, of structure to function. The unprejudiced mind cannot fail to read in every organ, nay, we may say in every cell and fibre, the inscription of purpose, and to learn thereby that they are the products of supreme power directed by supreme wisdom.

Purpose inscribed upon it.

The crown of creation

Man thus stands forth as the crown of creation, the chief of the works of God, even when we confine our view to that portion of his organization which allies him to his lower fellow creatures. But when, in addition, we consider him as an intellectual being, bending the forces of nature to his will; or as a moral being, with a conscience and a sense of right and wrong, or as a religious being, with hopes and aspirations raising him to seek communion with God, we are constrained to say with the Psalmist, "Thou hast made him but little lower than God;"[1] nay more, for hath not God Himself, in the person of His Son, in order to our salvation and restoration to His own image, condescended to take upon Himself our nature, so that the perfection of manhood is the "measure of the stature of the fulness

---

[1] Psalm viii. 5. Revised Version.

His future destiny.

of Christ." The Christian revelation assures us that man will yet be exalted to a position inconceivably more glorious than that which he has hitherto occupied, for as human nature in the person of Christ, is seated at the right hand of God, even so shall those who by faith are united to Christ, be elevated to bear the image of the heavenly. For He "shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation that it may be conformed to the body of His glory according to the working whereby He is able even to subject all things unto Himself." [1]

---

[1] Philippians iii. 21.

UTILITARIANISM

AN

ILLOGICAL AND IRRELIGIOUS THEORY OF MORALS

BY THE

REV. J. RADFORD THOMSON, M.A.

Argument of the Tract.

WHILE Christianity regards man as a spiritual being, amenable to a Divine law, Physical Ethics consider him as an organism susceptible of pleasure and pain, and governed in conduct by this susceptibility.

Utilitarianism is defined as the system of Morals which teaches that Pleasure is the chief good, and the standard of right, but that the pleasures of others than the agent are to be sought. The ethical theories of Bentham, Mill, Sidgwick, and Herbert Spencer are explained. The prevalence and influence of Utilitarianism are shown and accounted for.

The first principle of this system, viz., that Pleasure is the standard of right, is contested. Pleasure is shown to have no claim to such a position, either when sought by the individual for himself, or when sought by the individual for society. The impossibility is made manifest of applying the test of pleasure and pain as consequences following upon action. The dangerous results which would ensue upon the adoption of the Utilitarian standard are exhibited. The relations between virtuous conduct and happiness are considered. It is shown that Utilitarianism gives no account of the moral imperative, — of duty and conscience. What is termed Christian Utilitarianism is considered, and its inconsistency is made apparent. Right is shown to be discoverable by considering human nature in its completeness, —by examining the moral order discernible in the Universe,— by pondering the character of the Divine Ruler.

The superiority of Christianity over Utilitarianism is then a conclusion exhibited in detail.

UTILITARIANISM:

AN
Illogical and Irreligious Theory of Morals.

INTRODUCTORY.

The need of a reasonable foundation for human conduct.

THERE is no question of the present day more debated among thoughtful men, or more vital to the prospects of human society, than the question as to the foundation of right and duty. If to this opinion it be objected that men are generally agreed that certain actions are good and praiseworthy, and that others are evil and blamable, and that, this being the case, we need not trouble ourselves about "the why and the wherefore," the reply is, that to all who think, and sooner or later to all men, it must greatly matter what is the nature of the ground upon which obligation is believed to rest. A well-built house needs a sound foundation. Men will not always act, certainly in the times at hand they will not act, simply from habit, from tradition, from authority. Our times are times in which men ask a reason for everything, and in which they will not be content without a reason.

To neglect the principles underlying morality would be fatal to the best hopes of the future of humanity.

It is not to be expected that disagreeable duties will be readily performed, that a laborious and self-denying life will be cheerfully led, by men who do not understand why they should not abandon themselves to self-indulgence. Virtue must have its grounds, its sanctions, whether political, philosophical, or religious,—or all combined. Society will fall to pieces unless there are bonds strong enough to bind it together. If individual impulse and the desire for individual gratification become the principle of human action, men will return to the condition of the brute-beasts that roam through desert steppes or savage jungles. There are passions and notions and even principles abroad which, if unchecked, will lead to anarchy and to animalism. There would be no surer way of bringing these horrible evils upon mankind, than to cultivate indifference with regard to the principles of morality. It may be taken for granted that, if Christians do not inculcate and defend sound principles, there are those in abundance—the worst enemies of human society—who will take advantage of every opportunity to diffuse doctrines debasing and disastrous in their effects.

There are mainly two opposed theories of man's moral life.

There are now taken throughout civilised society, two contrasted and opposed views of human nature, human conduct, human life, and human prospects.

On the one hand is the distinctively Christian view, that man is the offspring of the eternal God, made originally in the Divine image, and consequently sharing in some measure the Divine Reason, and capable of apprehending and approving the Divine Righteousness. If this is so, then, although man *has* a body, which is the link that connects him with the realm of matter, man *is* a spirit. Related to the eternal order, man is endowed with a moral nature, and is called to a moral life. The conditions of his earthly existence, and the fact of his sinfulness, no doubt interfere with his perfect vision of God, and his perfect sympathy with Divine law. Yet he is susceptible of teaching both by Nature and by Revelation, and he is capable of being affected by those spiritual influences which are as real as physical forces. He can recognise moral authority; he can decline the imperious summons of the body, and the more imperious summons of society; he can consent to the demand of Conscience, he can obey the behest of Law, he can do the will of God.

Christianity regards man as a spiritual being, capable of knowing God, and of approving the law of Righteousness.

Those who take the spiritual view of human nature and morality differ, no doubt, among themselves. But all agree that man is spiritual, that the voice of Duty speaks from above, that Right is to be sought in what is higher and more authoritative than feeling,—whether the sensations of the body or the emotions of the soul.

Difference among Christians on speculative questions of Ethics does not interfere with their reverence in common for Right and Duty.

There is however another view of morality

The other theory regards man as a superior organism, with a wider range of function and of sensitiveness.

widely different from that now explained, and a view which has unhappily been adopted during the present century even by many whose sympathies are with the cause of virtue, so far as virtue subsists between man and man. The progress of physical science, and especially of physiology, the widespread acceptance of the modern theory of Development or Evolution, have concurred to prepare the way for a so-called scientific theory of morals in complete opposition to the rational and religious theory above set forth. The starting-point of this opposing theory of ethics is to be discerned in the very common belief that man is an organism, and nothing but an organism, that he is simply the most highly developed of the animals which inhabit this globe, whose highly organised brain and nervous system have taken on wider and finer functions than those discharged by the inferior creatures from which he is differentiated. Upon this theory mind is feeling,—more or less complicated. The theory in question does not pretend to do away with the mystery of Consciousness; it maintains the perfect distinction between the physical nervous shock and its psychical symbol in consciousness. But it regards all that is mental as the outgrowth of what is bodily. According to the Philosophy of feeling, pleasure and pain are the accompaniment of proper function, and accordingly the guide-posts pointing to proper conduct. By do-

This physical theory of Ethics naturally regards pleasure and pain as the true criteria of conduct.

ing what is pleasurable and avoiding what is painful, men will thus secure their own well-being, and promote the development of the race, both physically and socially. There is, according to this doctrine, no other law and no other motive for human conduct than the pursuit of pleasure and the avoidance of pain. As will be shown presently, there are introduced by ethical philosophers various considerations qualifying the crude *dictum*, that what gives pleasure is therefore right. Still it will not be denied that the advocates of physical ethics, whether Epicureans, Utilitarians, or Evolutionists, are of one mind as to the *criterion*, the law, the motive, the sanction, of human conduct, depending upon the experiences of pleasure and of pain alone.

Hence the importance of examining and refuting its claims.

The reader will now see clearly for what reasons we invite his attention to the doctrine of Utilitarianism. We know that this doctrine is held and propagated by sincere Theists, and even (it must be admitted) by some Christians. But we believe that it can be shown that its acceptance is inconsistent with Theism and with Christianity, and is antagonistic to that cause of independent and disinterested morality which those who profess Theism and Christianity should have at heart.

I.

THE CENTRAL DOCTRINE AND THE DEFINITION OF UTILITARIANISM.

Utilitarianism is a variety of Hedonism.

WHAT is the chief and central doctrine of Utilitarianism,—the one characteristic by which it is distinguished from other theories of morals,—that by which it is defined and described? The answer to this question is plain and unambiguous: *that course of action is right which issues in the largest amount of pleasure, or the least amount of pain, to all sentient beings who are affected by the action.* It is evident that two propositions are included in this definition: viz., 1. Pleasure is the chief good, and Pain the chief evil; and 2. the Pleasure and Pain to be considered are not simply those of the agent, but of all concerned.

Hedonism being the doctrine that Pleasure is the standard and test of right action.

"Hedonism" is the term used to denote the doctrine that pleasure is the standard and criterion of moral good, of right action. There have been and are, Hedonists who think that whatever gives pleasure to the agent, *i.e.*, the most pleasure on the whole, is therefore the right thing for him to do. Such Hedonists are called *Egoistic*, because the beginning and end of morality, according to them, is the pleasure of the agent. The higher and nobler Hedonists, however, take a very different view. As the proper aim of conduct, according to them, is the promotion of the happiness of the community generally, they are properly named, *Universalistic* Hedonists. Hedonists of this type, who aim at the general diffusion of pleasure, are commonly designated Utilitarians. Pleasure is still "the one thing needful," the one thing all-sufficient; but the pleasure sought is that which is diffused throughout society. This theory is thus far from being selfish: it is in its very essence benevolent.

Utilitarians hold that the one only and proper end of human action is the promotion and wide diffusion of Pleasure.

With regard to the first of the two propositions involved in the definition of Utilitarianism, misunderstanding is scarcely possible. It affirms that Pleasure is the *summum bonum*, the best thing in the universe, that to seek pleasure and to shun pain is the sum and substance of morality. Other things may be desired, but they are all desirable for the sake of the pleasure they yield. But Pleasure is an ultimate, self-sufficient end, is desired and is desirable for its own sake, and not for the sake of anything else. There is no need to bring forward any reason why Pleasure should be thus sought. The reason is engraved deeply upon our own constitution; it is in the very nature of things that Pleasure should be the ultimate end and justification of action. This principle is held to be intuitively apprehended.

It is easy to understand that Pleasure should be regarded by many as the highest good.

With regard to the second of these propositions, there is some opening for difference of opinion as

It is not very easy to see how wide is the range contemplated by those who profess Universalistic Hedonism.

to its exact meaning. For, whilst Utilitarianism is certain that an agent ought not to seek merely his own pleasure, it leaves it an open question how wide shall be the range within which the quantity of pleasure following upon any action is to be calculated. We are to act so as to give pleasure to others, and then we shall certainly act aright; but as to whom we are to please by our action,—with regard to this there may be room for discussion. Those immediately connected with us are too few, and offer a scope too limited. Yet to include all sentient creatures that are, or may be, in distant places and times, indirectly affected, seems, on the other hand, to give too wide a range.

The Utilitarian may consistently consent to suffer Pain for the sake of Pleasure only thus to be attained.

Although the Hedonist regards Pleasure as above all things to be desired, and Pain as above all things to be dreaded and avoided, it must not be supposed that he is unwilling in all circumstances to encounter pain, bodily and mental. Whether an Egoist or an Altruist, he is bound to brave suffering, when by doing so he can add to the total stock of pleasure. The benevolent Utilitarian recognizes that the plan of the world is such that some must bear ills from which their nature shrinks, in order that others may experience relief and joy. To him Pleasure is so excellent, that in order to increase its sum, he is willing to submit to the often grievous conditions by which only the general happiness can be secured and increased.

What does Utilitarianism claim to be? Its pretensions are large and bold.

Utilitarians claim that they have found the solution to the question which has agitated thinkers for centuries; that they have reached the Truth upon the highest of all human interests.

1. Its upholders assert that Utilitarianism is the *one true theory of Morals.* It is well known that for more than two thousand years various theories have been maintained for the scientific exposition and establishment of the morally good,—the right,—in human character and conduct. Apart from Revelation philosophers thought, speculated, and wrote, upon these themes. And even since Christianity has shed light of priceless, peerless value upon Morality, discussions have still prevailed, even amongst those who acknowledge the Divine origin and authority of our Religion, with regard to the foundations of right and of duty. Some have regarded Reason as the criterion of morality; some have sought the supreme test of Right in a "moral sense," others have looked for the standard of duty to the Will of God, as declared in Nature, and as more fully revealed in Scripture. There are those who seek the authoritative law of conduct in the organization of man's nature,—in the perfect exercise of human powers,—in the structure of Society, or in the law of the State,—or in that Universal Order which is recognizable in the creation. But the Hedonist seeks the solution of the vast question in man's capacity for pleasure, and the Utilitarian in that capacity for pleasure as possessed both by the human race, and by all sentient beings.

They claim to have laid a scientific basis for the legislation of all States.

2. Utilitarianism further offers itself as *the ultimate principle of legislation.* The advocates of the system rely for its general acceptance, in no slight measure, upon its supposed applicability to questions of political and legislative interest. They urge that no consideration is more potent with law-makers than the consideration of Utility. Is it not the aim of unselfish and public-spirited legislators to seek the increase of the pleasures and the diminution of the privations and miseries of the community? Statesmen and politicians have been accustomed to test measures proposed for their adoption by their agreement, or otherwise, with the formula: "Aim at the greatest happiness of the greatest number."

They claim to apply an intelligible and unfailing rule to the conduct of individuals.

3. The principle in question claims to be *the one all-sufficient practical rule of individual conduct.* We are told that the endeavour to apply other *criteria* will frequently involve us in perplexities and difficulties, and will lead to no definite and satisfactory result; but that nothing can be simpler than the inquiry, What course of action will yield most general pleasure? and that no moral law can be more plain and unquestionable than that which is yielded by translating the answer to that inquiry into the imperative mood. It is not denied that there are other more familiar and more "handy" rules of conduct, *e.g.*, What is customary? What is the law of the land? What is the dictate of

Religion? Nay, it is admitted that there is such a quality as Virtue, that it is right to do virtuous acts, that a man may properly ask concerning any proposed conduct, Is this according to Virtue? But as the Utilitarian considers that Virtue is good simply because its prevalence is a means to the increase of Pleasure,—which is the supreme end of conduct,—he does not look upon Virtue as conflicting with Utility, for the laws of Virtue are in his view only the subordinate rules framed for the purpose of promoting the pleasurable experiences of mankind.

They consider that they go below even Virtue in their foundation for Morality.

II.

THE HISTORICAL GENESIS OF UTILITARIANISM.

LIKE most systems of philosophy and morals, that now under consideration had its roots in Ancient Greece, where Aristippus and the Cyrenaics, and Epicurus and his school, advocated pleasure as the highest good. In modern times, Hobbes and Locke revived the doctrine of Hedonism, and Hume by his writings gave it a powerful philosophic impulse. But we will come direct to those names associated with our modern Utilitarianism, and with contemporary controversy.

The roots of all Hedonism are to be sought in the philosophies of Ancient Greece; though the growth sprung up afresh in the 17th and 18th centuries.

Utilitarianism, as a principle held and advocated by a powerful school of ethical and political philosophers, owes its origin to the writings of Jeremy

Jeremy Bentham the founder of Modern Utilitarianism.

Bentham. The first sentences of his work on *The Principles of Morals and Legislation* are so plain and outspoken that they may with advantage be quoted *verbatim* :—

Bentham's undisguised Hedonism.

> "Nature has placed mankind under the governance of two sovereign masters, *pain* and *pleasure.* It is for them alone to point out what we ought to do, as well as to determine what we shall do. On the one hand, the standard of right and wrong, on the other the chain of causes and effects, are fastened to their throne. They govern us in all we do, in all we say, in all we think. . . . The *principle of utility* recognises this subjection, and assumes it for the foundation of that system, the object of which is to rear the fabric of felicity by the hands of reason and of law . . . . By the principle of utility is meant that principle which approves or disapproves of every action whatsoever, according to the tendency which it appears to have to augment or diminish the happiness of the party whose interest is in question . . . . An action then may be said to be conformable to the principle of utility . . . . when the tendency it has to augment the happiness of the community is greater than any it has to diminish it."

He considers Pleasure and Pain not only as criteria of ends to be sought; but also as means to be employed by Society.

According to Bentham, pleasure and pain are not only of supreme importance as *ends* of human action, *i.e.*, to be sought and shunned respectively; they are equally important to Society, and particularly to the Law, as *means* by which those ends are to be secured. That is to say, the pleasure of the community is to be promoted by the infliction of suffering upon those individuals whose conduct tends to diminish the sum of the general pleasure. Although he expressly mentions physical, moral or popular, and religious sanctions, Bentham lays the greatest stress upon the *political* sanction, inasmuch as legislation is, in his view, the most important department of the science of human conduct.

Bentham regards the quest of Pleasure and the avoidance of Pain as the only motives to action.

In Bentham's view not only must conduct be judged by its tendency to promote pleasure or pain. Pleasure is a good, and the only good; pain an evil, and the only evil. But these experiences, actual or prospective, act also as *motives*. The only motives which can induce men to act are the hope of securing pleasure or avoiding pain. Thus Bentham is led into the paradox, that

> "*There is no such thing as any sort of motive that is in itself a bad one.*"

Even the pleasure of malice, envy, and cruelty is good, and

> "While it lasts, and before any bad consequences arrive, it is as good as any other that is not more intense." (!)

He identifies the Divine Will with the promotion of general enjoyment.

And although Bentham does not directly attack Religion, he resents every representation of the Deity which does not identify the Divine will with the intention to promote universal happiness, *i.e.*, the prevalence of pleasure. He complains that few of the votaries of religion are believers in the benevolence of God.

Mr. J. S. Mill's teaching is an advance upon Bentham's.

In our own time Utilitarianism has been recommended to public favour by the advocacy of Mr. J. S. Mill. The interest and charm of Mr. Mill's work on Utilitarianism do not lie merely in its style and its illustrations, but still more in the attempt to build a noble life upon a theory altogether insufficient to sustain it. His philosophy was a philosophy of pleasure, of utility; yet in two ways it differed from ordinary Epicureanism. It had regard to the welfare of the whole species without exception; and may justly be designated Universalistic Hedonism. This was one characteristic; there was a second: viz., that it did not,—as has too often been done,—sink all distinctions in the quality of pleasures, reducing them to one common level. He differed from his master, Bentham, in laying stress upon the qualities characteristic of different kinds of pleasures, varying with their sources and occasions.

Mill distinguishes among pleasures in the point of quality, and prefers higher to lower pleasures.

It must not, however, be lost sight of that Mr. Mill maintained Pleasure to be the one only standard of right.

> "The creed," he wrote, "which accepts as the foundation of morals, Utility or the greatest happiness principle, holds that actions are right in proportion as they tend to promote happiness; wrong as they tend to produce the reverse of happiness. By happiness is intended pleasure and the absence of pain; by unhappiness, pain and the privation of pleasure." "Pleasure and the freedom from pain are the only things desirable as ends."

Mr. Mill, like some others of the Epicurean school, assigns a higher place to

> "the pleasures of the intellect, of the feelings and imagination, and of the moral sentiments,"

than to the pleasures of sensation. But his peculiarity is that he recognizes the former class as of superior excellence by reason of their intrinsic

To introduce a principle qualifying pleasure is inconsistent with thorough-going Hedonism.

nature, and not merely because of their greater permanence, safety, and uncostliness. The question of course occurs, How is it to be decided which pleasure of two is the higher? to which the answer is given, That one which is preferred by those who are equally acquainted with, and equally capable of appreciating and enjoying both. Mr. Mill makes the very obvious mistake of supposing that no one who knows a higher pleasure will choose a lower. In this he judged men by the standard of his own preferences. He was right in saying

> "It is better to be Socrates dissatisfied, than a fool satisfied;"

but in saying this he virtually gave up the cardinal principle of Utilitarianism. If pleasure is the standard of good, a world of well-fed, mirthful fools is a better world than one peopled by discontented sages.

Bentham repudiated the term eudæmonism (from εὐδαιμονία, happiness) as less suited to describe his theory than hedonism (from ἡδονή, pleasure). The former seemed to him to point to a too elevated and refined theory of life. To Bentham, quantity of pleasure was the main thing: in an oft-quoted sentence he says:—

> "Given equal amounts of pleasure, pushpin is as good as poetry."

And this is sound hedonism, which Mill's doctrine of difference in quality of pleasure is not.

Sidgwick has well observed upon Mill's refined doctrine:—

> "If of two pleasures the one that is 'higher' or more 'refined' is at the same time less pleasant, the Hedonist must consider it unreasonable to prefer it."

Mr. Sidgwick renounces the dogma that Pleasure is the only thing desirable.

Mr. H. Sidgwick, in his *Methods of Ethics,* whilst dealing with the several systems of morals in a spirit of calm impartiality, still accepts the Utilitarian method as that which, in his opinion, has fewer difficulties than the others, and is, upon the whole, more satisfactory. It is, however, observable that he frankly gives up the dogma that Pleasure is the only desirable thing, whilst he holds fast to the belief that Pleasure is the ultimate standard of good.

The latest exposition of Utilitarianism that demands notice is that presented by Mr. Herbert Spencer, in his *Data of Ethics.* In the preface to this work we are informed that the author's

> "ultimate purpose, lying behind all proximate purposes, has been that of finding for the principles of right and wrong in conduct at large, a scientific basis."

To the establishment of satisfactory principles of morals he deems all the preceding parts of his task as subsidiary.

Mr. Herbert Spencer distinguishes between absolute and relative ethics.

In accordance with his special theory, Mr. Spencer considers

> "that Ethics has for its subject-matter that form which universal conduct assumes during the last stages of its evolution."

As, however, these stages have not yet been generally reached, "absolute ethics" have to be foregone in favour of those "relative ethics" which are adapted to the present state of society.

Now conduct is regarded as good or bad according to its effect on "the complete living" of one's self, one's family, and society. And

> "life is good or bad, according as it does, or does not, bring a surplus of agreeable feeling."[1] "The good is universally the pleasurable."[2]

Morality according to Mr. Spencer must be regarded in the light of Evolution.

Our ideas of the goodness and badness of forms of conduct

> "really originate from our consciousness of the certainty or probability that they will produce pleasures or pains somewhere."[3]

Pleasure is the ultimate moral aim, and

> "is as much a necessary form of moral intuition as space is a necessary form of intellectual intuition."[4]

But Mr. Spencer objects to the ordinary inductions of Utilitarians as crude and unscientific, and thinks them

> "but preparatory to the Utilitarianism which deduces principles of conduct from the processes of life as carried on under established conditions of existence."

The consideration of ultimate causal connections will, he thinks, lead us to wider views of human conduct. When moral phenomena are treated as phenomena of evolution, it is seen that the conduct is morally good which furthers the higher development of humanity,—that is to say—of human society. Singular results are reached by this method; *e.g.*, it is held that

---

[1] *Data of Ethics*, p. 28, [2] *Ibid.* p. 30. [3] *Ibid.* p. 32 [4] *Ibid.* p. 46.

> "the performance of every function is, in a sense, a moral obligation."[1]

Two things have to be considered: the connection between pleasure and normal development, and the influence of heredity. It is thus that Morality arises and is improved. On the whole, that conduct is good which is adapted to the maintenance and development of human society. The end is the prevalence of pleasure, the means are to be found in the connection between life-furthering conduct and pleasure. So that whilst in reading Mr. Spencer's book, the student is sometimes tempted to class the author with the "Perfectionists," as seeking the supreme good in the highest development possible of human nature and society, he is constrained by Mr. Spencer himself to assign to him the designation of a *Rational* as distinguished from an *Empirical* Utilitarian. Consistency there is not in this philosophy: Mr. Spencer sets out with the most sweeping assertions of the supremacy of pleasure; he ends with a picture of ideal society, where altruism tempers egoism, and where most of life's evils are averted, and sets this before men as the aim to which effort should be directed. The

Mr. Spencer prefers Rational to Empirical Utilitarianism and deduces laws of conduct from the consideration of ideal society.

His view of the combination of altruism with egoism.

---

[1] *Data of Ethics*, p. 76.

author of the Evolutional Philosophy leaves us in a state of uncertainty as to whether pleasure or progress is the chief aim, the highest motive, of human conduct.

It is not surprising that Utilitarianism is popular.

It is not difficult to account for the popular acceptance with which the system under consideration has met. There is much in Utilitarianism which is peculiarly suited to the temper of our age. 1. Its apparent simplicity and comprehensibility are in its favour. Whilst it requires application and reflectiveness to comprehend Aristotle's definition of well-being, Jouffroy's doctrine of the universal order, or Mr. Green's theory of perfection,—every one is persuaded that, as pleasure is so familiar a fact of experience, he is able to apply such a test as the measure in which human actions promote men's enjoyments or miseries. 2. This system falls in with what may be called the benevolently sentimental tendencies of the times. If the ancients erred in laying almost exclusive stress upon the sterner virtues, it must be admitted that in our times the softer excellences of character are put too prominently forward. Sensitiveness to suffering, especially to the suffering of others, is doubtless a virtue; but there are many signs that this is carried to an unwarrantable extreme. There are worse things in the world even than pain and weakness. But the pseudo-humanitarianism so prevalent in a

It has a superficial simplicity.

It displays sensitiveness to suffering.

somewhat luxurious and effeminate state of society, is apt to look upon suffering as the one thing above all to be avoided, and a diffusion of general enjoyment as the one thing to be sought. And with this temper it is obvious that Utilitarianism exactly harmonizes. 3. There is a superficial compatibility with Christianity, which recommends the system under consideration to many who would shrink from an obviously un-Christian doctrine. Mr. Mill has taken advantage of this fact. He remarks:

It has points of agreement with the precepts of Christianity.

> "In the golden rule of Jesus of Nazareth, we read the complete spirit of the ethics of Utility. To do as we would be done by, and to love our neighbour as ourself, constitutes the ideal perfection of Utilitarian morality."

The real connection between this system and our religion will be considered presently; we here simply point out an apparent and superficial correspondence which has assisted Utilitarianism into public favour. 4. And yet again, it should be noticed that there is so much in "the greatest happiness principle" which agrees with the theory and practice of our legislators, that in the view of many minds Utilitarianism, having entered by the open gate of Law, has taken full possession of the very citadel of Morality.

It has convenience as applied to legislation.

III.

It is an error to regard Pleasure as the highest good.

AGAINST the system of Morals now sketched, we first contend that—

THE RADICAL DOCTRINE OF UTILITARIANISM, VIZ., THAT PLEASURE IS THE "SUMMUM BONUM,"—IS ERRONEOUS.

A moral being should not aim at pleasure as the end of life.

1. *Pleasure is not the natural, universal, and supreme end of the actions of a moral being.* Pleasure and Pain are facts in human experience of great interest and significance. They are accompaniments of function, normal and healthy, or abnormal and unhealthy. But they are not, ordinarily, ends to be sought. It is not pleasure which is desired, but the exercise of some power, the satisfaction of some want. Pleasure is an inducement to eat; but hunger craves food, not the gratification of the palate. Pleasure is an inducement to exercise, but the impulse is towards the employment of the muscular powers, not towards the ensuing pleasure.

Mr. Sidgwick, a powerful reasoner, himself inclining to Utilitarianism, has attacked the doctrine that men are ever aiming at pleasure as the end of their actions. He contends that another impulse,—the love of virtue for its own sake,—comes into conflict with the desire for pleasure.[1]

To make pleasure,—even refined and religious pleasure,—the end of all our aims, seems very unworthy of such a being as man. There is something mean and ignoble, something degrading and to be ashamed of, in such a principle of action, as the supreme principle applying to all the many departments of human life. It is true that Utilitarians do not require that we should always consciously set this aim before us, that we should always consciously pursue it. But they do require that, when we reflect and analyse, we should recognize this as the substantial element in moral excellence, as the all-including and all-satisfying end of life. Now, that which is ultimate and elemental should surely be something upon which we can reflect with satisfaction, as meeting our most lofty aspirations, and fulfilling our noblest ideals. Can as much be asserted for pleasure, —of whatever grade?

---

[1] *Methods of Ethics*, p. 41.

There is no satisfaction in a life which aims at pleasure as the chief good.

Utilitarianism debases the noblest virtues of which rational and voluntary beings are capable, to a position in which they are subordinate and subservient to pleasure. If asked, Why should men be just towards their fellow-creatures? Why should they cultivate and practise purity of life and of heart? Why should they revere and confide in a God of faithfulness and love? the answer which the Utilitarian gives is this: Because justice, purity, and piety, are productive of personal and of general pleasure, and because the practice of these virtues will involve less suffering than their

Can we cultivate justice, purity, and piety, for the sake of the enjoyment they may yield?

neglect or repudiation! An answer this which it must need great prepossession in favour of his own theory, and great indifference to the realities of the case, for a thinker to accept with acquiescence and satisfaction.

The lengths to which a consistent Utilitarian must go.

Yet the Utilitarian does not hesitate to avow that what we call sin would not be sin, or at all events what we call crime would not be crime, were it not productive of suffering.

> "If it can be shown by observation," writes Professor Huxley, "or experiment, that theft, murder, and adultery do not tend to diminish the happiness of society, then, in the absence of any but natural knowledge, they are not social immoralities."[1]

This is a doctrine which confuses an accident with the essence of morality.

Pleasure being unsuitable as the end of an individual, is also unsuitable when sought over a wider range.

2. *If Pleasure is not the proper end of individual life, it cannot be that of the life of society.* There are many who would be ashamed to avow that their own pleasure is the one aim they seek by all their actions,—that personal enjoyment is the ultimate object of existence. Yet they think it a praiseworthy principle to seek nothing higher than the comfort and ease, the pleasure and enjoyment of their fellow-creatures. But reflection must convince us that an end, which is not satisfactory upon a small scale, cannot lose its unsatisfactory character when the scale is enlarged. If knowledge is good for the community, it is good for the

---

[1] *Nineteenth Century.* No. 3. May, 1877.

individual. The volume makes no difference in morality. Pleasure is *a* good both for one and for many; but as it is not *the* supreme good for one, it is not the supreme good for the nation or the race.

As far as we can trace the Divine Government, we do not find that Pleasure is its supreme end.

3. *Pleasure cannot be deemed the highest end contemplated by the government of God.* All who believe in a Divine Ruler and Lord, who is the Eternal Reason, must believe that there is *intention* in the Universe. To decide what the ultimate aim of all things really is, may be beyond our limited powers. Still, facts are accessible to us; we daily make our observations upon the course of Providence, and we draw our inferences. If Pleasure were the highest good, we should surely see in the world some evidences that this is the case. The Creator designs that Pleasure should be largely diffused among men; still Pain is an unquestionable fact, and its existence presents formidable obstacles in the way of believing what a religious Utilitarian must feel it a necessity to believe, viz., that God desires for His creatures as their highest good the largest possible amount of enjoyment. Indeed, Mr. J. S. Mill was so impressed by the magnitude of human suffering that he deemed it necessary, in order to retain faith in the benevolence of God, to renounce belief in His omnipotence.

It is apparent to the thoughtful observer that the end contemplated by the Author of all being is a far higher end than conscious enjoyment. God desires that His intelligent creatures should be conformed to His own holy character; "man's chief end is to glorify God;" and to this all else, even religious pleasures, must be subordinated; albeit the highest kind and degree of pleasure will be experienced by all who fulfil the chief end of their existence. They will "enjoy Him for ever." Enjoyment of the highest kind comes to the man who truly glorifies God.

God's aim is holiness, and to this happiness is subordinated; man therefore should seek to judge as his Creator and Ruler judges.

IV.

THE IMPOSSIBILITY OF APPLYING THE UTILITARIAN RULE OR TEST.

AT the very outset we ask, *What pleasures are to be calculated?* Are we to include in our reckoning the pleasures of intellectual exercise, of æsthetic appreciation,—which are enjoyed by comparatively few? On what ground can we exclude the pleasure of gambling, which is evidently to many persons one of the most intense of delights; for otherwise they would not sacrifice for its sake—reputation, wealth, domestic happiness, and other goods. On what ground can we exclude the pleasure of witnessing a bull-fight in Spain, or a pugilistic encounter in England? To multitudes, such spectacles afford the keenest enjoyment. On what ground are we to exclude the pleasures of malice, felt by many

The Utilitarian test is one which cannot be applied.

We cannot decide what pleasures to reckon.

who delight in the failures, the losses, the sufferings of their fellow-men?

We are at a loss whose pleasures to consider.

Whose pleasures are to be taken into account? Are we to regard the happiness of our family, our social circle? or are we to take a more extended view, and include our fellow-countrymen, those of our own race, or even all mankind, *i.e.*, so far as they may be supposed to be slightly and remotely affected by our actions? Are we to think of the present generation only, or of our successors in distant ages? Shall we deny ourselves, with the hope of promoting the welfare of generations that may never come into existence? There are other sentient beings upon the earth besides men: shall human happiness be sacrificed in order that multitudes of the inferior animals may live, and enjoy life's pleasures?

It is unjust to regard man's pleasures irrespective of their moral character.

Are the pleasures of men to be regarded without reference to their character? The rule proposed is:

> "Every person to count for one; no person for more than one."

If this is in any sense benevolence, it is certainly injustice. The rule seems to imply that the pleasures of the selfish, the vicious, the criminal, the idle, the injurious, are to be as much a matter of concern to us as those of the virtuous, the self-denying, the noble! Can this be what the Utilitarian intends? Or are we to suspend or modify the principle in certain obviously difficult cases?

The unreasonableness of Bentham's doctrine, taken by itself, has been well shown by Mr. Herbert Spencer, who concludes thus:—

> "If the distribution is not to be indiscriminate, then the formula disappears. The something distributed must be apportioned otherwise than by equal division."[1]

What gives great pleasure to one person gives no pleasure to another.

How are we to estimate the pleasures of people in different stages of moral development? Men's natural constitution differs in different cases: to one man pain is so repulsive that he will deem no pleasure worth acquiring which costs suffering; to another pleasure is so alluring that he will readily brave pain in its pursuit. Further, what is joy to one man is tedium to another. We cannot attribute capacity for intellectual pleasures to savages, or even to the lower types to be met with in civilized communities. Is that conduct to be commended which contributes to the enjoyment of the multitude, or that which favours the happiness of the cultivated few?

Pleasure and Pain are not measurable.

How are pleasures to be weighed against pleasures, and how are pleasures and pains to be compared? Many rules have been formulated, most of them expansions of the "Canons of Epicurus." All these rules presume that these experiences can be dealt with as lines which can be measured, or as solids which can be weighed. That pleasure is said to be preferable which involves least pain, etc. But however well these rules look upon paper, their uselessness is apparent when we attempt to put them in practice.

---

[1] *Data of Ethics*, p. 222.

The calculus not applicable to experiences so varying with different individuals.

The operations of weighing one pleasure against another, and any pleasure against any pain, are operations not simply difficult but impossible. Bentham tells us that we need a "moral Arithmetic" for the purpose, and Sidgwick terms the process the "Utilitarian calculus." But as there is no acknowledged unit of either pain or pleasure, there is absolutely no possibility of performing the balancing operation. For a comparison of the kind required will yield quite different results according to the temperament, the character, the circumstances of the persons undertaking it. Pleasure and pain are experiences too decidedly subjective to admit of such treatment as that proposed. And if the process were possible upon the understanding that *quantity* of feeling only is to be considered, it becomes impossible when *qualities* of experience are discriminated from one another.

The question must arise, At what cost of pain is it lawful to purchase pleasure?

How far is it justifiable to inflict pain, if there is a prospect that an excess of pleasure may ensue? The gladiatorial shows practised in ancient Rome yielded intense enjoyment to thousands of all ranks in life. And this enjoyment was purchased by the pain and death of a few wild beasts, and of a few men who were presumably of a more or less brutalized nature. If the pleasure preponderated over the pain, was the exhibition right?

It is often impossible so to calculate the consequences of actions, as to foretell what pleasures and what pains will follow. If the morality of actions depends upon such a calculation, great uncertainty cannot but attach to their moral quality; and the man who is anxious to do right must always be liable to make the discovery that he has been doing wrong.

The prediction of the consequences of actions is so difficult and uncertain that a rule involving such prediction should if possible be avoided.

Who shall be entrusted with the responsible offices of estimating and foretelling consequences, and so of deciding what conduct is virtuous and praiseworthy, and what is not? Shall every man do what is "right in his own eyes"? Then, one person will praise as virtuous acts which another will condemn as wrong. Shall the general sentiment, the public opinion, be accepted? Then the standard must vary with successive generations, and with differing communities. Shall a congress of philosophers be entrusted with the decision? Then we must wait for the promulgation of their decrees!

The ambiguity of the well-worn phrase "greatest happiness of the greatest number."

There is an obvious ambiguity in the expression, "The greatest happiness of the greatest number." One course of action may be such as to involve an equal distribution of pleasure amongst many; another course of action may be productive of great pleasure to the vast majority, and yet may be the means of rendering a few intensely wretched: which course should be adopted in order to fulfil the rule laid down in the above words of Bentham?

Are we to understand by it (1) the highest sum total of pleasure, all sentient beings considered; or (2) the highest average of pleasure diffused amongst those sentient beings? If the first interpretation be adopted, then it is good to inflict misery upon a few for the sake of the enjoyment of the many. If the second interpretation, then it is necessary to be very careful to avoid any actions which may lower the measure of happiness experienced by any. We are thus involved by the doctrine in a maze of casuistry.

V.

UTILITARIANISM MISAPPREHENDS THE RELATIONS BETWEEN VIRTUE AND PLEASURE.

Its unselfishness and benevolence are a good feature in Utilitarianism.

THE best feature in the system known as Utilitarianism, or Universalistic Hedonism, is its hostility to selfishness, a feature borrowed from the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ. But even this cannot make amends for its exaltation of Pleasure to the highest rank in the moral standard and in the moral motive. In fact, there is a discrepancy between the two leading principles of the Utilitarian theory which has sometimes escaped observation.

There is no logical pathway from pure Hedonism to what is called Utilitarianism. Hedonism means nothing if it does not mean that pleasure, personal happiness, is the one supreme end of life.

As pleasure is something personal, to make pleasure our aim is not consistent with universal benevolence.

It is often and justly said that if we seek the good of others in order that we may please ourselves, we are not acting benevolently, but selfishly, —as egoistic hedonists. If, on the other hand, we make the happiness of others our law, we desert Hedonism altogether,—surrendering pleasure, and adopting quite another principle of morals.

As far as observation goes, Virtue and Pleasure are not always conjoined in this life.

Is it a fact that all virtuous action tends to promote immediate happiness, if by happiness we are to understand pleasure or the absence of pain? The Utilitarians maintain that there is no excellence, no moral merit, in virtue except in so far as virtue furthers happiness. Now so far as observation goes,—and the Utilitarian holds experience to be the only source of knowledge,—it cannot be shown that all conduct which is admittedly virtuous does, as a matter of fact, increase the stock of pleasure enjoyed by mankind in this state of being. We see suffering result from right actions; yet sometimes—strain our eyes as we will —we can discern no compensating happiness ensuing. Only faith in goodness, only a conviction in a Divine Ruler of righteousness, can sustain us in the persuasion that such disinterestedly virtuous conduct should be approved and imitated. There have been cases in which Christians have endured torture and martyrdom from Pagans, or Protestants from Papists. Rather than abjure Christ, such holy sufferers have endured and even died. No doubt there have been instances in which martyrs have experienced an inward consolation, and even a joy of spirit approaching rapture. But generally speaking, those who have suffered death for the truth have endured pain amounting to anguish. Is their conduct to be admired and commended? If so, Why? Their sufferings were fearful, and they sank under them. If the spectators of these sufferings experienced no pain of sympathy,—as they probably did, thus increasing the sum of misery,—we can scarcely set the malevolent enjoyment of a fiendish or brutal inquisitor over against the martyr's anguish. But were there compensating advantages in remote and general happiness? Alas! in many cases, so far as earth is concerned, the purpose of the persecutor was fulfilled; independence of thought and speech was crushed, and bigotry triumphed!

On Utilitarian principles how can the self-sacrifice of the martyr and the patriot be justified?

If all kinds of pleasure-yielding actions cannot fairly be termed morally good, where shall we look for the distinguishing feature which confers this quality? Dr. Bain seeks it in the civic or social authority by which certain courses of conduct are prescribed. "Utility made compulsory" is moral goodness or rightness. The Government enjoins certain actions which are for the public good, *i.e.*, which are productive of general pleasure. Conscience is the mirror of social authority, and confirms inwardly the injunction imposed from

Dr. Bain's teaching,—that social authority sanctioning action productive of happiness constitutes rightness—is rather Hobbism than Utilitarianism.

without. Fear of punishment is the essence of moral obligation. This doctrine is scarcely Utilitarianism, high as is the value it sets upon Utility. It seems to make the State or Society the arbiter of right and wrong, and gives us no direction when our personal view of expediency points one way, and the strong hand of the law points the other.

Utilitarianism bases morality too much upon man's capacities, not enough upon his faculties.

The system now under discussion certainly bases Morality far too much upon the passive nature of man, upon his sentiency, and capacity for enjoyment. It has been said by Professor Grote, in technical language, that we have to consider in Ethics, not only the *summum bonum,* which corresponds to the want of human nature,—the *acquirendum;* but also the *summum jus,* the right, which corresponds to human activity,—the *faciendum.* He means to insist upon the great truth that a good man will be actuated in his conduct, not so much by considering what he may attain in the way of enjoyment, as by considering in what way he may exercise his powers and fulfil his actual duties. Not what affords most pleasure, but what calls out the powers of our nature in healthy and appropriate exercise, is the true moral ideal, at which ethical endeavour must always aim, and short of which ethical endeavour cannot do other than fail.

The ethical aim is right action, not agreeable feeling.

It is sometimes asserted that Utility is an ob-

Utility, when analysed, appears to be a very decidedly subjective standard of conduct.

jective standard of morality, one that can accordingly be represented to the mind, and applied without difficulty or ambiguity. Now, this is a very misleading view of the facts. Of all our experiences none are more purely subjective than pleasure and pain. Law, on the contrary, is an objective standard, one independent of our feelings, and apprehended by our intelligence. In pleasure and pain there is the utmost possible indefiniteness. What is very painful to one person is but slightly so to another, and that which scarcely yields a thrill of enjoyment to a man of a stolid constitution may bring ecstasy to a more susceptible and sensitive temperament. And the same individual is at different times sensitive to feeling in very varying degrees.

Virtue is not always rewarded upon earth with recompense of enjoyment.

It is certain that in this earthly life pleasures and pains are not apportioned in consonance with the character and deserts of men. Yet all mankind are undergoing moral discipline, culture, probation. The vicious are sometimes punished "in the flesh" for their vices, when those vices are violations of physical laws. The virtuous are sometimes permitted to suffer even for their virtues, when those virtues lead to conduct out of harmony with physical surroundings. We recognize intention, purpose, in this arrangement; but only (so to speak) in the very germ or bud. There is no completeness in the system; there are indications, but often little more than indications of the aims of a Holy and Beneficent Governor.

The probability, upon grounds of Reason, of a future life of retribution.

Reflecting minds have, in all ages, been led by these considerations to cherish the expectation of a life to come, and of future rewards and punishments. There is a moral perception which seems to require that the wrongs of time should be redressed in Eternity, that persecuted and calumniated goodness should be approved and recompensed, that prosperous wickedness should be overtaken by retribution, that the incomplete discipline should be continued, that the results of probation should be made manifest, that the unfinished work of God should be brought to a conclusion harmonious with the Divine attributes, and that the just government of the Almighty Ruler should be vindicated in the experience of all mankind, and in the presence of a satisfied and approving Universe.

VI.

UTILITARIANISM GIVES NO EXPLANATION OF THE MORAL IMPERATIVE.

Moral obligation is a fact for which a system of Moral Philosophy is bound to account.

IT is a crucial test to which we put the Utilitarian system when we ask, How does that system, explain the moral imperative? Is it compatible with the existence, the sacredness of duty? The doctrine which we are criticizing, is, that moral good and evil are merely kinds of pleasure and pain. Now, can it be maintained that we are bound to do the thing which causes pleasure as we are bound to do "the thing that right is?" that we are bound to refrain from all that causes suffering to ourselves or others, as we are bound to shun wrong-doing and sin? If we do feel ourselves morally obliged to do what involves pain to ourselves or others, is our justification, our defence, simply this,—that we expect present suffering to produce a larger measure of future joy?

"Ought" is a word often loosely and figuratively applied.

Utilitarianism nowhere more conspicuously fails than in attempting to deal with duty. If there is one factor in human nature more interesting and admirable than another, it is our subjection to moral obligation. The word "ought" is indeed often used very loosely and inaccurately, but it has a proper meaning, from which the secondary and figurative uses of it are derived. It is quite true that we say, I bought my watch from a good maker, and gave a large price for it; it *ought* to keep good time; or, My horse *ought* to do the distance in an hour; or, My sight being good, I *ought* to see a vessel on the horizon as I look out to sea. But these are simply adaptations of language, recognizing the dependence of certain movements or feelings upon the corresponding function. The real and true meaning of "ought" only comes out where voluntary conduct is in

Its real meaning is connected with voluntary choice in human conduct.

question, where an alternative between different courses of action opens up, and where the person who is called upon to act is conscious of the power of choosing one of these courses in preference to others. It is possible for a moral agent to speak truthfully or deceitfully, to deal honestly with his neighbour or to defraud him, to act like a churl or with generosity, to read the Scriptures or a foul French novel, to pray or to curse men and blaspheme God. But in every such case of moral alternative, one mode of action is morally imperative as compared with the other. Whenever we can say, This action is right, we can also say, This action it is the duty of a free and moral agent to perform.

Utilitarians cannot, however, regard human conduct in this light. Such independent obligation is most distasteful to Bentham, who in his *Deontology* says:—

Moral obligation is usually denied or explained away by Utilitarians.

> "It is in fact very idle to talk about duties." "The talisman of arrogance, indolence, and ignorance, is to be found in a single word, an authoritative imposture . . . . It is the word 'ought,' or 'ought not,' as circumstances may be . . . . If the use of the word be admissible at all, it 'ought' to be banished from the vocabulary of morals."

A popular writer of our day, Professor Bain, speaking of Morality, Duty, Obligation, or Right, says:—

> "I consider that the proper meaning or import of these terms refers to the class of actions enforced by the sanction of punishment." [1]

---

[1] *The Emotions and the Will*, chap. xv. p. 264.

A man's duty is, then, that for neglecting which he would be punished, either by actual suffering inflicted by law, or by public censure and social penalty. According to this moralist, Conscience is

> "that portion of our constitution which is moulded upon external authority as its type."[1]

Dr. Bain resolves the sense of Duty into fear of punishment.

If this be the case, then society, by means of government or otherwise, inflicts punishment upon such actions as interfere with the pleasures or increase the pains of men; and then association being established in the mind between punishable actions and punishment, men come to dread and avoid such actions. Duty and Conscience thus derive all their meaning from the social usage of punishment. Morality is the offspring, at all events in the first instance, of fear. The Conscience is a miniature police court within the breast, keeping order by threats of apprehension and consequent "pains and penalties." Upon this scheme of morals, duty has regard only to wrong-doing. It is no man's duty to do more than avoid such conduct as is punishable; it is meritorious to be benevolent, but it is not morally obligatory.

Mr. J. S. Mill regards Duty as the creature of Education.

Mr. J. S. Mill is no more successful in accounting upon Utilitarian principles for the great fact of moral obligation. He thinks that there is "an internal sanction of duty," but that this exists only for those whose moral feelings have been trained to take pleasure in whatever promotes the general good. It is his hope that a regard for the happiness of others may by careful education acquire the force of a religion. For those persons in whose mind no such association has been established, Mr. Mill does not seem to have any special sanction provided.

---

[1] *The Emotions and the Will*, chap. xv. p. 285.

Thus we come back to the question :—

The failure of the attempts made by Utilitarians to account for Moral Obligation.

How does the contemplation and calculation of pleasure and pain bring into the mind the conception corresponding to the word "ought"? Duty, moral obligation, is an idea which cannot be resolved into the dread of punishment. When a man says, "This I ought to do, however I may be regarded or treated in consequence by my fellow-men;" he is saying something quite different from "This it is for my interest to do; if I neglect to do it, I shall be punished by the powers that be." The two principles of action must not, and cannot, be confounded. Is there no difference between the principle which actuates a craven slave, and that by which the hero or the saint is inspired to suffer and to do?

Pleasure and Pain are lacking in moral authority.

The fact is, that, in pleasure and in pain, there is nothing morally authoritative. They are both great realities of experience, which no man can overlook in making and in carrying out his plans in life. But we do not feel that when these elements alone are present, there is of necessity the element of moral obligation. I ought to do what a just authority commands; but I cannot say, I ought to do what will deliver me from suffering, what will bring me delight. It is something quite different from interest, whether of one's self or of others, which accounts for the sacred imperative of duty.

Duty and Conscience are sacred.

Yet Duty and Conscience are realities, and among the most precious realities of human existence. In recent times their importance has been effectively exhibited by Kant, who has rendered no greater service to the cause of sound and religious philosophy than by his repudiation of all merely empirical explanation of our moral nature, his exaltation of the proper dignity of the moral agent, his insistance upon the sacredness of the moral law, the so-called "categorical imperative." A system like Utilitarianism has, at this point, to encounter all that is most vigorous and ennobling in contemporary philosophy, both on the Continent and in Britain

They are upheld as sacred by the greatest Moralists.

VII.

Christian Utilitarianism.

Some sincerely religious readers may object to the foregoing criticism that it is unfair to represent Utilitarianism and Christianity as opposed to each other. They may contend for the possibility of combining the two,—the philosophy of the Universal Hedonists and the religion of the New Testament. They may remind us that the Creator does really desire the happiness of His creatures, and especially of those rational beings whom He has created with capacities for pleasure so vast and varied. They may add that the Scriptures frequently depict the happiness attending a pious life as an inducement to embrace the true religion, and they may urge that the Saviour Himself invites the sinful and unhappy to His own gracious person, with the assurance that His yoke is easy and His burden light, and that He recommends His service by the glorious prospect of participation in the victorious Captain's blissful throne.

There is a Christian Utilitarianism, which represents Religion as aiming at happiness chiefly, and relying on the hope of happiness as its motive power.

There is prevalent, among many professed Christians, a view of the Divine Government which may be called "Christian Utilitarianism." It is not uncommon for religious persons to write and to speak as though the one great end sought by the Divine Ruler were the enjoyment of His creatures. It is urged that benevolence is one of the most glorious attributes of the Divine nature, that, being infinitely benevolent, God must desire to see all His creatures happy, that revealed religion has the happiness of men for its one great end, and that, sooner or later, pain and

Christian Utilitarianism represents it as God's chief aim to render man happy, and as man's chief aim to obtain the happiness God promises to the obedient.

sorrow must be banished from the universe, and the reign of perfect, unbroken, and eternal happiness must be established. Paley has even defined Virtue, as "the doing good to mankind, in obedience to the will of God, and *for the sake of everlasting happiness.*" He teaches that the will of God is indeed the rule, but that everlasting happiness is the motive to virtuous conduct.

But God is more concerned for men's goodness than for their enjoyment.

Such a doctrine as this is no doubt very different from the doctrine which leaves out of sight the existence and the government of a divine Sovereign. But it is a doctrine very much at variance with the stern facts of existence, and with the character of the Christian Revelation. Whatever we may think of God's benevolence, the existence of sin and the prevalence of a vast amount of wretchedness are undeniable. There is every reason to believe that the Ruler of all is less concerned for the enjoyment than for the moral improvement of His intelligent creatures. The Christian religion first of all deals with sin, and deals with unhappiness only in subordination to the higher problem of human life. The redemption of the Lord Jesus Christ is a redemption from the bondage and the curse of sin. The work of the Holy Spirit is a work of regeneration and of sanctification. That those who embrace the Gospel, who live a life of fellowship with God as His reconciled and obedient children, are introduced into a state of progressive happiness, is indeed true; and this is an arrangement of God's government, for which we cannot be sufficiently grateful. The promise is graciously given: "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all other things shall be added unto you." Still, the enjoyment which the Christian now finds in the reception of the truth, and in communion with God, varies to some extent with temperament and with circumstances, whilst this variety does not affect the individual's real relationship to his God and Saviour. Happiness is a merciful and precious addition to the privileges of the Christian; it is not the essence of his religious experience, nor is it the highest gift of God. Even when we think of the future state, of the abode and the occupations of the glorified, is it not the case that the first and most welcome thoughts of heaven are of the perfect conformity there attained to the holy will of our Father, and the freedom and devotion with which God's servants shall there serve Him day and night in His temple? The fellowship with Christ shall be perfect, and the society of the blessed shall be intimate. All this will be productive of complete, incomparable happiness. But it is not happiness that will make heaven; it is heaven that will make happiness.

Christianity promises first and chiefly spiritual blessings.

True Religion depicts happiness as something added to the chief good.

VIII.

THE ALTERNATIVE, IF UTILITARIANISM BE REJECTED.

Putting aside Utilitarianism, is there no better and truer standard of Right and Duty?

BUT if the Utilitarian standard of morality be rejected, what shall be accepted in its place? It is sometimes said that Utilitarians put forward a *criterion* of Right and Duty, at all events intelligible, but that alternative *criteria* are vague and indefinable. Every one, we are told, can understand what happiness is, and those who, by cultivation, are able to enjoy pleasures of a higher order, can classify the pleasurable experiences of which human nature is susceptible, and so can construct an intelligible rule of human conduct. But if this theory of duty be rejected, we are challenged to say what shall be substituted for it. The demand is reasonable.

How to discover rectitude.

In our judgment the standard of right is discoverable, and may be apprehended with growing completeness by those who will regard three important considerations.

Our own mental and moral constitution.

1. To understand what is the true and authoritative principle of morality, it is necessary to examine our own constitution, the powers with which we are endowed, the development of which those powers are by exercise capable, and the perfection of our

nature which we may thus attain. Professor Calderwood has well said:—

> "If a general conception can be formed of the end or final object of our being, it must be by reference to the higher or governing powers of our nature; and as these are intellectual or rational, the end of our being is not pleasure, but the full and harmonious use of all our powers for the accomplishment of their own natural ends."[1]

The same truth has been thus expressed by a philosophical writer of a different school from Professor Calderwood, the late Professor T. H. Green, of Oxford. He says:

> "The real value of the virtue rises with the more full and clear conception of the end to which it is directed:—as a character, not a good fortune; as a fulfilment of human capabilities from within, not an accession of good things from without; as a function, not a possession."[2]

And again:—

> "Our theory has been that the development of morality is founded on the action in man of an idea of true or absolute good, consisting in the full realization of the capabilities of the human soul."[3]

The vast and moral Order with which we are related.

2. It is not a complete view of the foundation of ethics to confine our attention to the development of our own powers. We are but units in a vast whole, members of a glorious and mystic body. In the universe of being, every conscious individual has his allotted place, and his allotted function. Corresponding to the capacities and faculties within

---

[1] *Handbook of Moral Philosophy*, p. 133.

[2] *Prolegomena to Ethics*, p. 265.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 308.

are the relations with which we are encompassed, the beings in federal relation with ourselves. There is a moral *cosmos*, a universal order, from which we cannot escape, and in which we may bear a serviceable and not ignoble part.

The Divine Lawgiver and Sovereign, whose attribute is Righteousness.

3. It is often and justly said that a law implies a law-giver. The Utilitarian theory is not indeed inconsistent with Theism, but it is a theory which may consistently be held, and is held, by those who do not believe in God. It is the favourite theory of those who regard evolution as the great formative principle of the universe, who consider intelligence to be a development from sensation, and moral distinctions and moral faculties to be a further development from the same elements, along the same line. It is especially the theory of those to whom susceptibility to pleasure and pain is sufficient to account for all that moral life which constitutes the chief prerogative of humanity. As it represents obligation as persistent instinct or impulse, and responsibility as liability to punishment by human governors, or at all events by human society, this theory is naturally acceptable to those who maintain that what they call "the hypothesis of God" is unnecessary and superfluous.

Man's aspirations towards participation in God's character:

That man admires and aspires after moral excellence which has never been in his experience realized, may be taken as a suggestion of a nature purer, nobler than his own, either nearer to absolute perfection, or actually possessing and manifesting it. His moral nature is, on the one hand, so imperfect, and yet on the other hand has so inextinguishable a yearning for flawless and awful goodness, that it has ever been deemed the truest and mightiest witness to the Deity. Very beautifully has Professor Grote expressed this commonplace of the higher philosophy in these words :—

And subjection to God's will.

> "If we think of that which should be, and consider at the same time that the mind and the will of God are according to this, we are in point of fact trying to imagine what it is that He thinks and wills. And I do not know that we can have a better notion of morality than as the imagination on our part of the thought and will of a better and superior Being." [1]

The necessity of a Creator of the physical universe, and of a Ruler of the moral universe.

If it is difficult to give any reasonable or even plausible account of *the material universe* apart from the existence and will of a Divine Creator and Lord, whose reason and whose purpose are manifest in the marvellous arrangements and harmony of this majestic cosmos; it is in our apprehension utterly impossible, apart from the same great fact, to give any explanation of the far more wonderful and interesting *realm of moral life* into which every human being is introduced. Our Reason presumes a Divine Mind, in which all things are perfectly comprehended, which we apprehend in their incompleteness. Our freedom presumes a peculiar relation to the Eternal Will, and involves certain and inevitable responsibility to the Omniscient Judge.

---

[1] Professor Grote on *Utilitarianism.*

The Divine Will is a reality.

Those who identify the standard of righteousness with the Divine Will are sometimes met with the objection that such an identification tends to make morality altogether arbitrary. If what God wills is the right, then (it is urged) if God were to will in the contrary direction, what we hold to be right would become wrong, and what we hold to be wrong would become right. How can that be an independent standard of morality which is dependent upon the will even of God?

The Divine will is not to be regarded apart from the Divine Reason.

The answer to these difficulties is to be found in the consideration that the Divine Will (if we may use language so human) is according to the Divine Reason. The Will is simply the imperative, so to speak, corresponding with the Reason, which is indicative. Man's will is often capricious, is often in contradiction to his highest conceptions and convictions, is often according to his evil passions or foolish fancies, and not according to his reason. With the all-perfect Deity this is not the case. Whilst the attributes of Wisdom, Justice, and Benevolence prescribe the law of morality, the Will of God publishes, sanctions, and enforces it. The revelation of the law in the human conscience and in the inspired volume is a revelation of the Nature and Attributes of God, but it is a revelation made by the Will of God,—the practical manifestation of Himself as the Ruler and Judge of His intelligent and responsible creatures. Whatsoever rewards or punishments obtain under the Divine government are administered by the Infinite Will of the Governor Himself. But they are simply the expressions in judicial action of the nature and perfections of the Eternal, who is just and good beyond all degrees.

Summary of the foundations of morality.

If, then, we are asked, What is there open to us as an alternative theory, in case we are convinced of the unsoundness of the Utilitarian doctrine? the answer is plain. Conscience, the imperative of Duty, within, has corresponding to it the standard of Right, the Moral Law. Where is this to be discovered? How is this to be determined? 1. Regard man's nature; and the Moral Law, the Ethical Standard, is to be found in the harmonious and perfect development and exercise of the powers with which the Creator has endowed him. 2. Regard the Moral Universe of which man forms a part; and the Moral Law, the Ethical Standard, is to be found in the Universal Order, the good, *i.e.*, the perfection, not of the individual agent, merely, but of all beings with whom he has relations, and whom his actions may affect. 3. Regard the Supreme Lord, Ruler, and Judge of the Moral Universe; and the Moral Law, the Ethical Standard, is to be found in the Divine nature and attributes of Him who is infinitely good.

IX.

UTILITARIANISM AND CHRISTIANITY CONTRASTED IN THEIR PRINCIPLES AND EFFECTS.

The general acceptance of Utilitarianism would be injurious to public morality.

ALTHOUGH it is true that there are amongst those who claim to be orthodox Christians, some who have given their assent to the theory known as Universalistic Hedonism, it is necessary to expose the erroneous nature of this system, because a theory is often held by those who are not alive to all its proper and logical consequences. The general acceptance and prevalence of Utilitarianism, moreover, would be most injurious to the public morals. If men generally come to believe that whatever promotes pleasure is right, that there is no test of rightness, except only a tendency to increase enjoyment and to diminish suffering, that Utility is to be enthroned as the sovereign principle by which mankind are to be swayed; then the general conception of human nature will be degraded, for human nature will be considered as constructed for no higher end than pleasure; then morality will suffer, for virtue will be despised, except where it is seen to be a means to happiness; and then Christianity will be discredited, for a religion which exalts righteousness and holi-

It would discredit Christianity.

ness, and which endeavours to raise men above the mere consideration of consequences, cannot but appear as hostile to the scientific law and aim of human life. Whilst our Saviour lays the greatest stress upon the morality of the heart, and insists upon the uprightness, the purity, the benevolence of the thoughts and desires; the Utilitarian doctrine offers no effectual check to the evil imaginations and longings, which are prone to flourish unrestrained in the recesses of the soul. There is danger lest those who deny the independent authority of right should deem themselves at liberty to indulge their covetousness and fleshly appetites, when they can do so without fear of detection, and without involving any manifest injury to their fellow creatures. Religion bids men aim at an ideal excellence, and reveals God as making this life one of moral discipline and probation; Utilitarianism bids men seek the general enjoyment, and either misrepresents God as supremely concerned for human pleasures, or else maligns Him as unable to secure an end which, nevertheless, upon the whole He aims at. For these reasons we think it necessary to protest against doctrines which in many respects harmonize with current feeling and wishes, to show that however they accord with imagination and sentiment, they have not the support of reason or of facts. Utilitarianism is in the view of those who look below the surface a

Whilst Utilitarianism regards life as given for enjoyment; Christianity regards life as probationary and disciplinary.

decidedly irreligious system of morals. It is not, indeed, denied that upon it may be based rules of conduct and legislative enactments which may secure a certain measure of individual and social well-being. But it leaves out of sight, where it does not actually negative, all that is of highest interest in human life. It dispenses with our spiritual nature, for it analyzes man's constitution into his capacity for pleasure and pain, and bases the rules of life upon that analysis.

What Utilitarianism dispenses with.

It dispenses with a future life, for it regards the present state of society in connection with prospective development upon earth, as a complete and sufficient whole. It dispenses with God, for even if it tolerates in words the supposition that there is a Supreme Ruler and Magistrate who sanctions beneficence of conduct; it has really no place for a Supreme Being, the Ideal of goodness, fellowship with whom is spiritual life. In a word, it makes man "of the earth, earthy."

It is favourable to Secularism.

It favours such a view of the future of human society as was lately advocated by a distinguished English judge, who holds that religion may disappear, that Christian self-denial and self-sacrifice may vanish, and that life may still remain a very tolerable, indeed, a very agreeable and comfortable thing.[1] It secularizes all that has hitherto been irradiated with a halo of Divine glory. Such is the profession of one of its champions:—

---

[1] Vide Mr. Justice Stephen's article in the *Nineteenth Century* for May, 1884.

> "Now," says Mr. Herbert Spencer, "that moral injunctions are losing the authority given by their supposed sacred origin, the secularization of morals is becoming imperative."[1]

Against such principles we have an impregnable bulwark in Christian morality. The superiority of Christianity over Utilitarianism is, upon an examination of the two systems,—the two theories of human life,—perfectly incontestable.

The unselfishness of Utilitarianism is borrowed from the New Testament

1. The best feature in the theory considered in this Tract, is its unselfishness, its benevolence. This is cordially acknowledged. But this feature is not original, it is borrowed from the New Testament, from the life of Christ Himself, from the teaching of His inspired Apostles. It is Jesus of Nazareth to whom we owe the maxim, "Do unto others as ye would that they should do unto you," from whom we have received the great law of the redeemed society, the new commandment, "Love one another." It is He who, by His teaching and by His example, has shown us the beauty of self-denial. The world had not to wait for Comte to teach the lesson, "Live for others;" it is a lesson which has been familiar for more than eighteen centuries in the Church of Christ. It was an Apostle of our Lord who bade us "bear one another's burdens," and "look every man upon the things of others."

---

[1] *Data of Ethics*, p. 4.

The superiority of the aim of Christianity, which seeks not the enjoyment, but the improvement and moral and spiritual welfare of men.

2. When we ask, what services are we to render our fellow-men, how is our good-will to express itself?—the answer of the Christian to this inquiry sets his religion in a light far brighter and holier than that which the Utilitarian reply sheds upon his system. The latter professes a desire to promote the enjoyments of his fellow-creatures; this is his highest aim, for if he espouses the cause of Liberty, of Order, of Virtue,—it is only because he holds Liberty, Order, and Virtue to be conducive to human happiness. The Christian, on the other hand, seeks the glory of God in the moral and spiritual welfare of the race. All measures devised for human improvement are in his view inadequate, which do not go to the root of the evil. Believing that the Gospel is the Divine remedy for sin and its fearful consequences, he seeks to bring the Gospel home to the sinner's heart, with a view to his salvation. His aim is, by the use of Divinely appointed means, and in dependence upon Divine Agency, to bring about the spiritual renewal of these whom he desires to benefit. To him, the restoration of men to the Divine image and favour is a far loftier aim than the mere increase of their gratifications; and this is an estimate which a just mind will approve.

3. Whilst Utilitarians judge men by their outward actions, and commend such conduct as tends to promote pleasure, Christians are bound by the

teaching of their Divine Master to lay stress upon the thoughts and intents of the heart. The standard of Utility is independent of spiritual excellence; according to it, that course of action is deserving of approval which tends to the general pleasure. The standard of Christian morality has reference, not to acts merely, but to the dispositions, purposes, and habits of the soul; it requires sincerity, uprightness, purity of heart, as indispensable to acceptance with Him who judgeth not as man judgeth. If man have a spiritual nature, and if action is valuable as expressive of spiritual principles, then it is indisputable that Christianity, which places man's spiritual state and experience foremost in dignity and importance, takes a juster view of humanity than is taken by the Utilitarian philosophy.

Whilst Utilitarianism dwells upon action, Christianity insists upon inner spiritual goodness.

4. When the motive to action is taken into consideration, our estimate of the comparative and indeed of the absolute merit of the Religion of Christ becomes still more apparent. Some Hedonist philosophers maintain that we seek to benefit others only for the sake of the pleasure such conduct brings to ourselves; others maintain that natural sympathy is a sufficient motive. The first of these principles of action must constantly fail to secure benevolent conduct; it operates only when the pleasure exceeds the sacrifice involved. The second is a natural and

The superior excellence of Christianity.

The motive upon which Christianity relies, viz.—love and gratitude towards a Redeeming God.

powerful motive, but is not competent to vanquish human selfishness. How conspicuously superior to other considerations are those which Christianity brings to bear upon those who yield themselves to its sacred influences! The love of God the Father is a motive to the soul that recognizes and feels it, sufficient to awaken love to "the brethren whom we have seen." "If God so loved us, we ought also to love one another." "The love of Christ constraineth us." The Cross has ever been the most powerful corrective to human selfishness, the most powerful incentive to human philanthropy. From the Cross an inspiration proceeds which is sufficient to sustain the Christian labourer in his service, to nerve the Christian soldier for his warfare. He who seeks the good of his fellow-men can come under no power so invincible as that which is supplied by the love and sacrifice of the Redeemer, who "bare our sins in His own body on the tree." For this power reaches and sways the inmost heart of the believer.

Failure of Hedonistic effort.

5. Let it be borne in mind that those who on the Hedonistic system seek the happiness of their fellow-men, often fail in their endeavours; for happiness is not a commodity that can be transferred from one to another. Neither can they be assured of attaining happiness for themselves. On the other hand, the Christian, seeking a higher aim than pleasure, will not be left unrecompensed.

Success of Christian effort.

If the Universe is the work of a righteous and benevolent God, who has the highest moral ends before Him in the government of the conscious and voluntary natures He has created, it is reasonable to believe that ultimately He will confer happiness upon those who are obedient and submissive to His will. The Christian cannot seek enjoyment, either for himself or for others, as the highest aim of his action. Fellowship with God, likeness to God in moral attributes: this is his highest conception of well-being. Yet, finally and in eternity, a character in harmony with Divine rectitude and purity cannot but be appointed to experience the truest happiness, whatever may be the calamities and sorrows of the earthly life. There is accordingly the glorious prospect before the Christian of realizing for himself, and for those whose welfare he is the means of promoting, the inexhaustible meaning of the exclamation of the Psalmist, "In Thy presence is fulness of JOY; in Thy right hand there are PLEASURES for evermore"!

The Christian attains final acceptance and everlasting felicity.

HISTORICAL ILLUSTRATIONS

OF THE

NEW TESTAMENT SCRIPTURES

BY THE

REV G. F. MACLEAR, D.D.

Argument of the Tract.

IT is recorded of Lord Lyndhurst that shortly before his death he was found by a friend with a pile of infidel books upon his table. Taking up one of them, he remarked that it might seem strange for him to be so occupied, but that his mind required exercise, and that on the main issue his conviction was decided. "Of evidence, at least, he felt that he was as competent a judge as most men; and such evidence as might be adduced for the Resurrection had never broken down." What this consummate judge of the value of evidence said respecting the facts of our Lord's Resurrection is extended in this Tract to the Historical illustrations of the narrative contained in the New Testament itself, which Classical writers have bequeathed to us, and which coins and monumental inscriptions still further confirm. The evidential value of these Illustrations, it is shown, cannot be broken down.

HISTORICAL ILLUSTRATIONS

OF THE

NEW TESTAMENT SCRIPTURES.

INTRODUCTION.

The composite character of the New Testament.

So accustomed are we to regard the New Testament as one Book, the work of a single writer, that we are apt to forget and overlook the variety of its contents. It consists of twenty-seven separate and independent documents, composed by eight or nine different persons, at very different times, and under the most varied circumstances. The works of the writers of the Old Testament fall under the head of history proper. They set before us primarily and mainly the history of a nation. In the New Testament all this is changed. The authors of the Gospels are not in any sense historians of their nation. They are biographers of Christ. Even the writer of the Acts of the Apostles confines himself to the doings of those whose business it was to spread abroad the doctrines taught by Christ throughout the world.

Contrast between the Old Testament and the New.

Historical allusions in New Testament incidental.

The points, therefore, where the documents of the New Testament touch upon history proper are not direct but indirect, and the allusions are and must be incidental. But for this very reason they are extremely important as respects their evidential value. Why? Because in the first place, to maintain accuracy in the wide field of incidental allusions is a matter of the utmost difficulty, and no one but an honest, truthful writer would venture on such a perilous experiment at all. Because, in the second place, historical accuracy in reference to minute incidental allusions is utterly at variance with the mythical spirit, of which the narrative contained in the New Testament is sometimes affirmed to be the product. If the whole story is a myth, fabricated *ab initio*, its composers would have had no object in maintaining historical accuracy at all, or in being careful that their facts agreed with the testimony of contemporary classical writers.

Classification of the allusions.

These incidental allusions may perhaps be most conveniently arranged as follows:—

(i.) Those that bear upon the political condition of Palestine generally;

(ii.) Those that refer to the Roman authorities, who are represented as exercising power over the country;

(iii.) Those that relate to its Jewish rulers;

(iv.) Those that concern the condition of the Jewish people;

(v.) Those that touch on the Greek and Roman world.

i. THE POLITICAL CONDITION OF PALESTINE.

Complicated political state of Palestine at the time.

THE political condition of Palestine at the period with which we are dealing, was singularly complicated and anomalous, and its complications perplexed even the sagacious Tacitus.

The successive phases during fifty years.

We gather from Josephus that within a space of fifty years it passed through five distinct phases. First it was a single united kingdom under a native ruler;[1] then it was split up into a set of principalities under native ethnarchs and tetrarchs;[2] then it was partly amenable to such petty governors, and partly reduced to the condition of a Roman province;[3] then it was once more a kingdom governed by a native sovereign;[4] and eventually it was reduced to a state of complete subjection to Rome, though, according to Josephus, a power seems to have been entrusted to a surviving member of the Herodian family of superintending the Temple at Jerusalem, and some of the ecclesiastical arrangements.[5]

---

[1] Jos. *Ant.* xvii. 14–18.

[2] Jos. *Bell Jud.* i. 33, 8; ii. 6, 3.

[3] *Ant.* xviii. 1, 1.

[4] *Ant.* xviii. 5, 1.

[5] *Ant.* xx. 1.

It would be impossible to point to any similar period of fifty years in English history, marked by so many changes, and it would not have been surprising if, supposing them to have been merely ordinary writers, those who compiled the narratives contained in the New Testament, had evinced a sense of difficulty and hesitation in the face of political changes so intricate and so anomalous.

No sense of perplexity betrayed by the writers of the New Testament in noticing the various phases in the civil government of Palestine.

But is this what we find? On the contrary, the writers of the New Testament nowhere betray any sense of perplexity. They mark quite incidentally and without the slightest trace of strain or effort the various phases, extraordinary as they were, in the civil government of Palestine. Thus at the era of the Advent we (i) find the country subject to the sole government of Herod the Great;[1] then (ii) we have his dominions partitioned amongst his sons, while one, Archelaus, reigns over Judæa with the title of *king*[2]; then (iii) we see Judæa reduced to the condition of a Roman province, while Galilee, Ituræa, and Trachonitis continue under native princes;[3] then (iv) in the person of Herod Agrippa I. we have the old kingdom[4] of Palestine restored; and finally (v) we observe the whole country reduced under Roman rule, and Roman procurators[5] re-established, while a certain degree of deference is paid to Herod Agrippa II., to whom Festus refers St. Paul's case as presenting special difficulties.[1]

---

[1] Matt. ii. 1; Luke i. 5.

[2] Matt. ii. 22.

[3] Luke iii. 1.

[4] Acts xii. 1.

[5] Felix, Acts xxiii. 24; Festus, Acts xxiv. 27.

The agreement of the New Testament statements with those of Josephus.

Thus there is a remarkable *general* agreement with the statements of Josephus, and no one can study the scenes which incidentally illustrate this agreement and say they are forced or artificial. But there is far more than a mere general agreement. Palestine had not been conquered in the ordinary way. It had passed under the Roman dominion with the consent and by the assistance of a large party among the inhabitants themselves. Hence, as has been observed,[2] it presented not only a mixture, and sometimes an alternation of Roman with native power, but a peculiar double system, extending to the administration of justice, the levying of taxes, military commands, and the coinage of the country.

The minute accuracy of the New Testament a striking testimony to its truthfulness.

Few would deny that it would need more than ordinary knowledge to describe with ease and freedom such a complicated condition of things. Accuracy in minute particulars in reference to details so unique, arising sometimes out of a dual and sometimes a triple form of government, is a striking testimony to the truthfulness of the writers. Do they stand this test? A few instances will suffice to prove this.

At the epoch of the Incarnation the decree

---

[1] Acts xxv. 15.

[2] Rawlinson's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 240.

The double system as regards several matters illustrates the minute accuracy.

The census.

goes forth from the authority which alone could order it, for the taxation of the Roman world.[1] It is carried out in Palestine under the superintendence of a Roman procurator,[2] but respect is paid to the peculiarly Jewish custom, which required that each inhabitant of Palestine should be enrolled in *his own city*.[3] Two methods are employed for marking the epoch of the commencement of the preaching of the Baptist, the year of the Emperor in the capital of the west, and the year of the Jewish high-priesthood in Palestine.[4] Two systems of "watches" mark the divisions of the hours of the night, the proper Jewish reckoning of three, and the Roman reckoning of four periods.[5] The tribute paid to Cæsar is called by one name, *census*;[6] the ecclesiastical tax for the support of the Temple worship by another, the *didrachm*, or half-shekel.[7] Judas brings a detachment of the Jewish Levitical guard[8] to apprehend our Lord in the Garden of Gethsemane, but Roman soldiers stand sentinel over His sepulchre.[9] The Jewish hierarchy condemn Him to death for blasphemy,[10] but possess-

The mode of marking time.

The watches.

The civil and ecclesiastical tax.

The military forces.

---

[1] Luke ii. 1. [2] Luke ii. 2. [3] Luke ii. 3. [4] Luke iii. 1.

[5] Comp. Lam. ii. 19; Judg. vii. 19; 1 Sam. xi. 11 with Matt. xiv. 25; Mark xiii. 35.

[6] Matt. xxii. 17; Mark xii. 14: "Is it lawful to pay *tribute* to Cæsar, or not?"

[7] Matt. xvii. 24: "They that received *the half-shekel* came to Peter, and said, Doth not your Master pay *the half-shekel*? Revised Version.

[8] John xviii. 3. [9] Matt. xxvii. 65. [10] Matt. xxvi. 66.

ing no longer the power of life and death, are obliged to urge a political charge against Him before the tribunal of Pilate,[1] who alone possessed the power of the sword. The Jewish mode of capital punishment is by stoning;[2] the Roman method, except in the case of Roman citizens,[3] is by scourging and crucifixion.[4]

The modes of capital punishment.

In carrying out the crucifixion of our Lord, we notice that while Roman customs are strictly maintained, they are softened by the more merciful provisions of the Jewish law. The Sufferer is condemned to bear His Cross; a title or superscription is affixed to it;[5] He is fastened to it with nails;[6] soldiers are stationed below it, under the command of a centurion to see that the sentence is duly executed, and the garments of the crucified are distributed amongst them. But Jewish mercy softens some of the details. The potion is offered the Divine Sufferer for the purpose of deadening the pain;[7] the fracture of the legs, technically called *crucifragium*, is adopted to mitigate the punishment and hasten death;[8] the bodies of the crucified are not allowed to moulder on the cross

Roman and Jewish customs co-exist at our Lord's crucifixion.

---

[1] Matt. xxvii. 2; Mark xv. 1.

[2] John x. 31; Acts vii. 58; xiv. 19.

[3] Jos. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 14, 9; Livy xxxiii. 56. [4] Acts xxii. 24.

[5] Sueton. *Calig.* 32, "Titulus, qui causam pœnæ indicaret.

[6] This was the common practice in Palestine, as we are expressly informed by Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 14, 9.

[7] Matt. xxvii. 33, 34. See Lightfoot *Hor. Heb.* [8] John xix. 31.

under the action of sun and rain, or to be devoured by birds or wild beasts,[1]—they must be removed before the evening.[2]

Latinisms and Hebraisms co-exist.

And as it is with peculiarities of custom, so it is with peculiarities of language. We find Latinisms and Hebraisms occurring, with the utmost naturalness, side by side in the same writings. We have Latin military terms, like "centurion;"[3] "legion;"[4] "prætorium,"[5] a palace; "custodia,"[6] a guard; "speculator,"[7] a soldier of the guard; "colonia,"[8] a colony; Latin coins, like "quadrans,"[9] a farthing; "denarius,"[10] a penny; "assarion,"[11] a farthing; Latin terms connected with the revenue as "census," tribute;[12] with military punishment, as "flagellare,"[13] to scourge; Hebraisms, like "Corban," "Rabbi," "Rabboni," "Raca," "Gehenna," "Mammon," "Boanerges," "Talitha cumi," "Ephphatha," "Hosanna," "Cephas," "Barjona."

Words are fossil history.

"Words," as Archbishop Trench has reminded us, "are fossil history, they are the marks and vestiges of great revolutions," and "anyone with skill to analyze the language might re-create for himself the history of the people speaking that language."[1] This is true also of the language of the New Testament. It is fossil history. These Latin and Hebrew words existing side by side are not artificially but naturally introduced, and illustrate the semi-Jewish and semi-Roman condition of the Holy Land, and the co-existence at this particular juncture of semi-Jewish and semi-Roman ideas. Remarkable as this is, it becomes more remarkable when we reflect that only just *at this period of the New Testament could this co-existence have been so strikingly marked, for " it came to an end within forty years after our Lord's crucifixion."*[2]

---

[1] Hor. *Epist.* i. xvi. 48; Juv. *Sat.* xiv. 77.

[2] Deut. xxi. 22, 23. This is specially witnessed to by Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* iv. 3, 2.

[3] Mark xv. 39, 44.

[4] Matt. xxvi. 53; Mark v. 9.

[5] Matt. xxvii. 27; John xviii. 28, 33; Phil. i. 13.

[6] Matt. xxvii. 65.

[7] Mark vi. 27.

[8] Acts xvi. 12.

[9] Matt. v. 26; Mark xii. 42.

[10] Matt. xviii. 28.

[11] Matt. x. 29; Luke xii. 6.

[12] Matt. xvii. 25.

[13] Matt. xxvii. 26; Mark xv. 15.

Only at this period of the New Testament could this co-existence have been so strikingly marked.

ii. ROMAN EMPERORS AND ADMINISTRATORS.

Roman emperors and governors.

THE Roman emperors mentioned by name in the New Testament are Augustus, Tiberius, and Claudius. The Roman governors are Cyrenius or Quirinus, Pontius Pilate, Felix, Festus, Sergius Paulus, and Gallio.

Their existence attested by classical historians.

Classical history attests that these persons existed at the time specified, that they bore the offices here assigned to them, and that the actions ascribed to them are either exactly such as they performed, or at least are in perfect keeping with their known characters.

Respecting the Emperors we notice that their

---

[1] Trench's *Study of Words*, p. 96.

[2] Rawlinson's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 241.

Emperors mentioned in the right order.

names occur in the right order, nor is there any trace of error respecting their chronology. From Classical authors we gather that the first Emperor acceded to the throne forty-four years before Tiberius, and that the reign of Claudius extended from A.D. 41 to A.D. 54. When, therefore, St. Luke places the birth of our Lord in the reign of Augustus,[1] and the commencement of His ministry in the fifteenth year of Tiberius,[2] and when he represents Claudius[3] as having acceded to the throne before the second journey of St. Paul, he states facts which are in perfect harmony with legitimate inferences from the entirely independent statements of Tacitus[4] and Suetonius.[5]

The census directed by Augustus.

The carrying out of a census in the reign of Augustus is illustrated in a very striking manner by the statements of Suetonius, who records three instances[6] of a census having been held in his reign. He also mentions the fact that the emperor kept a "statistical table" or "inventory"[7] of the whole empire, which on his death was produced and read in the senate, as a sort of Roman doomsday book.

That the census took place when Quirinus was governor of Syria has often been regarded as an error, and whole volumes have been

---

[1] Luke ii. 1.
[2] Luke iii. 1.
[3] Acts xi. 28.
[4] Tac. *Ann.* i. 3; Suet. *Tib.* 21.
[5] Suet. *Claud.* 25.
[6] Suet. *Oct.* 27
[7] Suet. *Oct.* 28.

The double governorship of Quirinus.

written on the subject. But whatever may be the precise meaning of the verse in St. Luke,[1] whether we render the words πρώτη ἐγένετο "took place before Quirinus was governor," or throw the emphasis on ἐγένετο, "first took effect," there has been no serious refutation of the view first developed by Zumpt that Quirinus was *twice* governor of Syria, once in B.C. 4, when he began the census, and once in A.D. 6, when he carried it to completion. His prominence on this occasion accords with the statements of Tacitus[2] and Suetonius, that, though he was of obscure and provincial origin, yet he was a loyal soldier, and won his consulship by activity and military skill, earning a triumph for his successes in Cilicia.

Reign of Claudius.

The Famine.

Of the reign of Claudius we have two notices in the Acts of the Apostles. The first relates to the famine predicted by Agabus[3] as destined to affect the whole Roman world, and states that the predicted famine actually came to pass in the reign of this Emperor. Standing alone this remark does not suggest much, but it receives a signal confirmation from the fact that the first, second, fourth, ninth, and eleventh years of the reign of Claudius were remarkable for famines in some district or other. The famine in the eleventh year was of such terrible severity, that "at Rome there were provisions for no more than fifteen days," and a clamorous throng crowded round Claudius "and drove him to a corner of the forum, where they violently pressed upon him, till he broke through the furious mob with a body of soldiers." Such is the statement of Tacitus,[1] and it is confirmed by Suetonius[2] and Josephus.[3]

---

[1] Luke ii. 2.

[2] Tac. *Ann.* ii. 30; iii. 22, 48.

[3] Acts xi. 28.

The other incident relates to the discovery by St. Paul at Corinth[4] of Aquila and Priscilla, natives of Pontus. From Pontus they had migrated to Rome, but had been driven thence by an edict of Claudius, commanding all Jews to depart from the capital. What do Roman writers say on the subject? Suetonius tells us that

Expulsion of the Jews from Rome.

Suetonius.

> "owing to the tumults which the Jews stirred up at Rome, at the instigation of one Chrestus, Claudius decreed their expulsion from the city."[5]

Tacitus.

What does Tacitus record? He informs us[6] that in the year A.D. 52,

> "a decree of the senate was passed for the expulsion of the astrologers from Italy."

That by the word "astrologers" the historian meant to indicate the Jews, with others, is extremely probable. For that the edict was subsequently dropped appears from the fact that we find Aquila and his wife again in Rome. This curiously agrees with the words of Tacitus respecting the edict, for while he describes it as "stringent," he also says it "was ineffectual."

---

[1] *Ann.* xii. 43.

[2] Suet. *Claud.* 18.

[3] Jos. *Ant.* xx. 5, 2.

[4] Acts xviii. 2.

[5] Suet. *Claud.* 18.

[6] Tac. *Ann.* xii. 52; see Lewin, *Fasti. Sacri.* p. 295.

Roman governors.

So much for the Emperors. When we pass from them to the Roman Governors, we find that they too not only occupy their proper chronological position, but that their characters, as represented in the New Testament, agree with Classical authors.

Pontius Pilate

Of Quirinus we have already spoken. Pontius Pilate as an historical personage stands out clearly in the pages of Tacitus. The successor of Valerius Gratus,[1] he occupied the position of procurator, under the proprætor of Syria, for ten eventful years, from A.D. 26 to A.D. 36. His head-quarters were at Cæsarea,[2] and thence he came up with his troops to keep order during the greater festivals. Between his legionaries and the Jewish people there was no love lost. His attempts to hang up some brazen shields as trophies in the Temple;[3] to use "the Corban" or Sacred Fund for the erection of public tanks for the comfort of rich and poor;[4] and to crush in blood the insurrection which this caused, must have increased the general ill-will. Still, with all his shortcomings, the Evangelists, consistently with historic truth, portray him as "the Roman magistrate" anxious to

[1] Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 4, 2.

[2] Jos. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 14, 8.

[3] Jos *Ant.* xviii. 3, 1.

[4] *Ant.* xviii. 3, 2.

His strict observance of Roman law.

carry out all the regulations prescribed by Roman law. This comes out at every turn when our Lord is brought before his tribunal. Possessing only the power of a *legatus* in his own province, he has no *quæstor* to conduct the examination for him of the Great Accused. He is obliged to hear the charge in person. With his Roman sense of justice he will not consent, as the Jews desired of him,[1] to be the executioner before the judge. He summons our Lord within his *prætorium.* He examines Him himself on the triple political charge of religious agitation, of forbidding tribute, of assuming the title of "King." The Jews bring forward neither proofs nor witnesses. He tries to discover whether the confession of the Prisoner, always held desirable by Roman institutions, will enable him to take cognisance of the accusation. During the trial a message from his wife,[2] whom a relaxation of the law attested by Tacitus,[3] had allowed him to bring with him from home, warns him not to assist in shedding the blood of "that Righteous Man." At one point, anxious to roll off the burden of a terrible responsibility, he refers the case to the tribunal of Herod Antipas,[4] just as Vespasian did

The trial of our Lord before him.

---

[1] John xviii. 30.

[2] Matt. xxvii. 19.

[3] In early times the Roman magistrates had not been allowed to take their wives with them into the provinces. But this rule had gradually been relaxed, *and lately a proposition of Cœcina to enforce it had been rejected.* Tac. *Ann.* iii. 33, 34.

[4] Luke xxiii. 7.

afterwards in another case out of compliment to Agrippa.[1] At another, he offers the people their choice between our Lord and Barabbas.[2] Then thinking that a punishment only less terrible than the cross, that of the Roman scourge, will satisfy the tossing, clamorous throng, he gives orders that it shall be carried out, and in his position of sub-governor, having no lictors at his disposal, he is fain to inflict it by the hands of *soldiers*.[3] Finally, seated on the *Bêma* or judgment-seat, surmounting the tesselated pavement, to which Roman custom attached a special importance,[4] he pronounces, as being invested with the "*jus gladii*," the irrevocable word, "*Let Him be crucified*."

The scourging by the soldiers.

The sentence.

At every turn, quotations from Classical authors attest the accuracy in the details of this Roman trial. Is it less discernible in the portraiture of Pilate himself? Does he manifest a contemptuous disregard for the religious susceptibilities of the Jews? Has he not given many proofs of it before? Has he not again and again evinced that contempt for the nation so strongly entertained by his patron Sejanus? Has he not at one Passover massacred upwards of three thousand Jews "like victims,"[5]

The portraiture of Pilate himself.

His cruelty

---

[1] Jos. *Bell Jud.* iii. 9, 7, 8. [2] Matt. xxvii. 17; Mark xv. 9.

[3] See Livy xxxiii. 36; Jos. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 14, 9.

[4] So necessary was the tesselated pavement and the tribunal deemed to the forms of justice, that Cæsar carried about with him, on his expeditions, pieces of marble neatly fitted and a tribunal. Suet. *Jul.* c. 46.

[5] Jos. *Ant.* xvii. 9, 3.

and filled the Temple courts with their dead bodies? Has he not at another slain many thousands more,[1] and "mingled the blood of certain Galileans with their sacrifices?"[2] Does he show vacillation and irresolution? What else did he display, when he withdrew the silver eagles, and removed the votive shields he had set up at Jerusalem? Is he terrified, when he hears the crafty, well-chosen cry, "*If thou let this man go, thou art not Cæsar's friend*"?[3] Is he resolved at all risks to save himself from the wrath of the gloomy suspicious Tiberius? Does not History supply the key to his selfish terror? Were not his own hands stained with blood? Was it not the "leges majestatis,' the laws of treason, which the emperor exacted with the most remorseless severity? The historians Tacitus and Suetonius[4] supply the answer.

His vacillation.

His selfishness.

Felix.

Take next the character of Felix. The sacred writer treads as firmly and unhesitatingly in his description of the brother of Pallas, the favourite freedman of the Emperor Claudius, as in that of Pilate. And his statements are confirmed by classical writers. St. Paul is committed to his charge by Lysias, the military officer at Jerusalem, who in a letter explains the case. The Apostle is put on his trial, and Tertullus the advocate urges the charge against him. In the course of his speech he seizes on such points in the government of Felix as could meet any praise. Josephus[1] helps us to understand what these were. The advocate cleverly dwells on the abuses and disorders the procurator had put down. He keeps out of sight the severity with which this had been done. Felix remands the Apostle to prison, and keeps him there upwards of two years in the hope of extorting money from him. Is not this quite in keeping with the character of one of whom Tacitus says,

---

[1] *Ant.* xviii. 3, 2; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 9, 4.

[2] Luke xiii. 1.

[3] John xviii. 12.

[4] Tac. *Ann.* iii, 38; Suet. *Tib.* c. 58.

His character the same as described by Tacitus.

"that he indulged in every kind of barbarity and lust, and exercised the *power of a king in the spirit of a slave?*"[2]

Is it surprising that with the sensual Drusilla by his side, he "trembled when the Apostle reasoned of "righteousness and temperance and the judgment to come"?[3] Did not tales of his barbarity and cruelty reach the ear of the emperor, and did he not escape a severe sentence only through the influence which his brother Pallas exerted over Nero?[4]

Festus.

The arrival of Porcius Festus in A.D. 60, as successor to Felix, marks one of the most certain dates in the chronology of the Acts. His comparatively equitable and mild character, as it comes out in the Sacred Narrative, is attested also by Josephus, who bears witness that he tried to administer real justice, and did not stain his hands with bribes. Justice and impartiality mark his dealings with St. Paul. Three days after his arrival in Syria he goes up to Jerusalem. He has already at Cæsarea[1] heard serious complaints against the Apostle, and on reaching the capital he is importuned by the chief priests and elders to allow the hated prisoner to be tried at Jerusalem.[2] But Festus is well aware that as a Roman citizen the Apostle cannot be brought before the Sanhedrin without his own consent, and promises to give a full and fair audience to their complaints at Cæsarea. Eight or ten days afterwards he returns to the palace, and the very next day takes his seat on the tribunal to hear the case. His accusers reiterate their charges against the Apostle, but have no witnesses to bring forward. Festus perceiving the weakness of their case, proposes that the offences against the Law and the Temple shall be heard before the Sanhedrin, but with characteristic fairness, expressly stipulates that this shall be done *in his own presence.* Then the Apostle, certain that the Jews will never let him depart alive from Jerusalem, falls back on his own special privilege as a Roman citizen. He pronounces

---

[1] Felix, during his period of office put down false Messiahs (Jos. *Ant.* xx. 8, 6; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 13, 4), the followers of the Jewish pretender (Acts xxi. 38), riots between the Jews and Syrians in Cæsarea.

[2] Tac. *Hist.* v. 9. Comp. Tac. *Ann.* xii. 54. [3] Acts xxiv. 25.

[4] Jos. *Ant.* xx. 8, 9.

His character as attested by Josephus.

His relation to St. Paul.

---

[1] Acts xxv. 24.

[2] Acts xxiv. 3.

the memorable words "*I appeal unto Cæsar,*" and Festus loses all power over him.

St. Paul's appeal to Cæsar.

The Roman law of appeal would be utterly out of place in a mythical narrative. No one but a recorder of literal facts would ever have ventured even to allude to it. Under the Commonwealth Roman law had allowed every citizen, except in certain specified cases, to appeal to the people from the sentence of a magistrate condemning him to be scourged or put to death. Under the Empire the appeal was transferred from the people to the Cæsar, and in the reign of Trajan we find Pliny, the proconsul of Bithynia, sending even those Christians who were Roman citizens to the imperial tribunal.[1] St. Paul, therefore, is strictly within his right, and the spirit of the Roman law fully justifies the course he now takes. The sacred historian does not mention any *written* appeal being handed into the court. An ordinary uninformed person might well have supposed it was necessary. But it was not so. The mere utterance of the single word "*Appello*"[2] removes the Apostle's cause from the local to the imperial tribunal. Festus consults for a moment with his *consiliarii,* or council of assessors,[3] whether the appeal is legally admissible or not,[4] and the case is at an end. We notice the

Right of appeal.

No written appeal required.

---

[1] Pliny's *Letters,* x. 97.

[2] Ulpian, *Digest,* xliv. 1, 2.

[3] For in a few cases the right of appeal was disallowed. Ulpian, *Digest,* xlix. 1, 16.

[4] Suet. *Tib.* 33; *Galb.* 14; Cic. *in Verr.* ii. 2, 32.

The report of Festus to Agrippa.

same spirit of fairness in the report he makes of his prisoner's case before the vassal-king Agrippa II., and he allows the Apostle a patient hearing before his guest, hoping thus to ascertain more certain details to lay before "his Lord" at Rome.

The expression "Lord" applied to this Emperor.

The very occurrence of this expression "Lord" here is a "water mark" of truth in the narrative. Augustus and Tiberius had alike refused this title of despotic power, such as a master had over a slave. But Caligula was greedy of this title of absolutism; and after him it was assumed by his successors, till in the reign of Domitian[1] it was assigned to the Emperors by law.

The character of Festus illustrated by Josephus.

Every detail of the narrative bespeaks a characteristic fairness on the part of Festus, and is illustrated by the testimony of Josephus, that he was a just as well as an active magistrate.

Gallio.

Equally truthful and consistent in the classic history is St. Luke's portraiture of Gallio, the proconsul of Achaia, during St. Paul's stay at Corinth in A.D. 53.[2] And first, why does the sacred historian call him a "proconsul"? Why not "proprætor"? In a mythical narrative either title would have been equally appropriate. But what does Strabo tell us?[3] Achaia, we learn, had been a senatorial province under Augustus, and therefore its governor was a *proconsul.* But what does Tacitus record? According to him, Achaia had been placed on the list of *imperial* provinces,[1] and therefore its supreme magistrate was a *proprætor.* Is there not some mistake? Suetonius shall solve the doubt. Claudius, he tells us, the successor of Tiberius, had not been four years in power before he restored Achaia to the senate,[2] and so gave it once more a *proconsul* for its governor. And then as regards Gallio himself, an ordinary writer, describing an imaginary character, might have been pardoned, had he portrayed him as a stern and imperious governor, vindicating with rigour the majesty of Roman law. But is this how he is described in the Acts? On the contrary we find him with easy indifference refusing to settle a quarrel between the members of a merely "tolerated religion." He declines to intervene in questions lying beyond his jurisdiction. He regards with calmness an outbreak of violence before his own tribunal. He dismisses the whole case with easy indifference. A startling portrait, *if it were not true*, of a Roman governor! But how else should we have expected the brother of Seneca to behave, whom his contemporaries[3] describe as popular with all men,—a bright, light-hearted, charming com-

---

[1] Suet. *Domit.* 13.

[2] Acts xviii. 12–17; Jos. *Ant.* xx. 8, 10. "When Gallio was *proconsul* of Achaia." Revised Version.

[3] Strabo xvii. p. 840; Dio. Cass. liii. 12.

Correctly described as proconsul.

His character.

Contemporary testimony to him.

---

[1] Tac. *Ann.* i. 76.

[2] Suet. *Claud.* 25.

[3] Statius refers to him as "the sweet Gallio." Stat. *Sylv.* ii. 7, 31, comp. Pliny, *N.Q.* iv. Praef.

panion, and such a friend "that those who loved him to the utmost did not love him enough? Would a stern, imperious demeanour have been consistent with such a character?

iii. JEWISH KINGS AND PRINCES.

THE Jewish kings and princes mentioned in the New Testament are Herod the Great, Archelaus, Herod Antipas, Herod Philip II., Herod Agrippa I., and Herod Agrippa II.

Herod the Great.

St. Matthew commences his narrative by telling us that "Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judæa in the days of Herod the king,"[1] or as St. Luke expressly styles him, "the King of Judæa."[2] The title here given is amply attested by the Jewish historian. Herod the Great, the second son of Antipater, who was appointed procurator of Judæa by Julius Cæsar in B.C. 47, was elected by the Romans to the governorship of Galilee, though only, according to Josephus, in his fifteenth year.[3] In B.C. 41 he was appointed "tetrarch" of Judæa, a title which he exchanged in the following year for that of "king,"[4] in accordance with a decree of the Senate, through the influence of Antony.

His title of King.

---

[1] Matt. ii. 1.

[2] Luke i. 5.

[3] More probably his 25th. See Merivale's *Romans under the Empire*, iii. 377.

[4] Jos. *Ant.* xiv. 14, etc.; *Bell. Jud.* i. 14, 4.

Having captured Jerusalem, B.C. 37, and established his authority, he won the favour of Octavius,[1] the conqueror at Actium in B.C. 31, and received from him, besides several important cities, the province of Trachonitis, and the district of Paneas. These facts are attested not only by Josephus, who tells us that

> "from the time he was declared *king* by the Romans, Herod reigned thirty-seven years,"[2]

but by Tacitus also, who expressly mentions

> "Antony as giving, and Augustus as confirming him in the *regal title.*"[3]

His cruelty.

The reign, after the acknowledgement of his claims by Augustus, was free from external troubles, but was stained by an almost uninterrupted series of acts of bloodshed perpetrated in his own family and amongst his subjects. The cunning he displayed towards the Magi[4] is illustrated by numerous other instances of cruelties, deceptions, and suspicions, which fill many chapters in Josephus.[5] His arrest of the chief men throughout his dominion just before his death, and his instructions to Salome that they should be butchered immediately upon his decease,[6] that thus his funeral might at least be signalized by a real mourning, reveals a bloodier

His cunning.

---

[1] *Ant.* xv. 6, 6; *Bell. Jud.* i. 20, 1.

[2] *Ant.* xvii. 8, 1. [3] Tac. *Hist.* v. 9. [4] Matt. ii. 7, 8.

[5] *Ant.* xv. 1, 3, 6, 7; xvi. 4, 8, 10; xvii. 3, 6, 7.

[6] *Bell. Jud.* i. 33, 6.

The massacre at Bethlehem.

temper than even the massacre of the innocents at Bethlehem, which Josephus passes over as positively insignificant, when compared with other atrocities of the monarch.[1] Having rebuilt Zion, as Nero rebuilt Rome, leaving a city of marble where he had found it of mud and lime, Herod had commenced in B.C. 18 a new and more costly temple than had ever yet been raised in honour of God in Palestine. "Forty and six years is it," said the Jews afterwards to our Lord,[2] "since the building of this Temple began." The words imply that it was not yet finished. And this is strictly true.

The building of the Temple.

The Temple itself was built in a year and a half. But constant additions were made; and though the courts and cloisters were finished in eight years more, so as to be fit for the actual services of religion, we have positive evidence[3] that the whole structure was not finally complete till A.D. 64, or six years before its destruction by Titus.

After the death of Herod St. Matthew informs us that Joseph, having been some time in Egypt,

Archelaus.

> "arose, and took the young child and his mother, and came into the land of Israel. But when he heard that Archelaus was reigning over Judæa in the room of his father Herod, he was afraid to go thither, and being warned of God in a dream, he withdrew into the parts of Galilee."[4]

---

[1] Macrob. *Saturnal* ii. 4.

[2] John ii. 20. See Sanday's *Fourth Gospel*, p. 67.

[3] Sanday, p. 66.

[4] Matt. ii. 21, 22.

From this we infer (i.) that Archelaus succeeded Herod in the government of *Judæa*, properly so called, but (ii.) that his power did not extend to Galilee. Do these facts, thrown in so incidentally, agree or not agree with what Tacitus and Josephus tell us as regards the territorial arrangements made on the death of Herod?

The testimony of Tacitus and Josephus.

What does Tacitus say? He tells us[1] that Herod's sons ruled over his realm under a threefold division. What does Josephus tell us? That his kingdom was divided amongst three of his sons, Archelaus receiving *Judæa*, Samaria, and Idumæa; Antipas the tetrarchy of Galilee and Peræa; and Philip that of Batanæa, Trachonitis, and Auranitis; while Salome, sister of the great king, obtained Jamnia and Ashdod.[2] The rumour, which is said by the Evangelist to have reached the ears of Joseph,[3] is very significant in the light of what Josephus tells us. From him we learn that till a few days before his death Herod had nominated Antipas[4] as his successor, and only in his last moments had he altered his will, and mentioned Archelaus for the post.[5] Moreover, by the appointment of Augustus, after hearing the claimants for the government of Judæa, Archelaus was declared *Ethnarch*[6] of Judæa. But in the interval between

---

[1] *Hist.* v. 9.

[2] Jos. *Ant.* xvii. 11, 4.

[3] Matt. ii. 22.

[4] *Ant.* xvii. 6, 1.

[5] *Ant.* xvii. 8, 1; *Bell. Jud.* i. 32, 7.

[6] *Ant.* xvii. 11, 4.

His title as King.

the death of Herod and his departure for Rome, he had been *saluted as king* by the army, a title which Augustus assured him should be his, if he ruled successfully.

Once more, St. Matthew adds that

> "when Joseph had heard that Archelaus was reigning over Judæa, in the room of his father Herod, *he was afraid to go thither.*" [1]

His cruelty.

Had he any ground for this fear? Josephus supplies a ready answer. He tells us that only a few days after the death of Herod, on the occasion of a tumult, Archelaus let loose a body of soldiers upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, who put to death upwards of three thousand,[2] and that within the sacred precincts of the temple itself. Moreover, as he began, so he went on, far surpassing his father in cruelty, oppression, and sensuality, without possessing his father's talent or energy, till he was accused by his subjects before the Emperor, and banished to Vienne in Gaul, a fact which is confirmed by Strabo.[3] The fears, therefore, of Joseph, *thus incidentally mentioned,* were grounded on facts attested in the clearest manner by competent historians.

Herod Antipas.

Of Herod Antipas what do we learn from Josephus? That he was tetrarch of Galilee and Peræa, that he first married a daughter of Aretas, king of Arabia Petræa, that he afterwards committed adultery with Herodias, the wife of his half-brother, Herod Philip, that this involved him in a war with Aretas, who invaded his territory, and defeated him with great loss. This defeat, Josephus tell us, some of the Jews regarded as a judgment of God upon the tetrarch for the murder of John the Baptist, a good man, and held in high repute by his nation, whom the tetrarch put to death through fear of a popular insurrection.[1] The genuineness of this passage is admitted even by Strauss, and he observes that between the statement of the historian, who attributes the murder to fear of a popular rising, and that of the Evangelist, who ascribes it to offence at John's stern rebuke of his adultery, there is no real contradiction.

---

[1] Matt. ii. 22.

[2] *Ant.* xvii. 9, 1-3; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 1. 3.

[3] Strabo xvi. 2.

The murder of John the Baptist.

The features of character developed by the tetrarch and Herodias respectively in the murder of the Baptist, are strictly in keeping with all we know of them both from the Jewish historian. Herod himself is weak rather than bloodthirsty, his tyranny is mingled with timidity and cunning, the cunning of the "fox," which our Lord imputed to him.[2] The malice and revengeful temper of Herodias, on the other hand, are clearly brought out in the narrative. But it is worth observing that the same headstrong determination, the same reckless disregard of consequences, which induced her now to demand the brave Baptist's head, led

Character of Herodias.

---

[1] *Ant.* xviii. 5, 2.

[2] Luke xiii. 32.

her afterwards, according to Josephus, to urge her husband to go to Rome and claim the title of "king," which had lately been given to her brother Agrippa.[1] Her overweening ambition was his ruin. Antipas not only failed, but was deprived of his dominions, and banished to Lyons, in Gaul.

Herod Philip.

Herod Philip II., the son of Herod the Great and Cleopatra, received on his father's death the tetrarchy of Ituræa and Trachonitis. The Gospels tell us nothing to his discredit. Their silence is all in his favour, and is strikingly confirmed by the positive statements of Josephus. He affirms that his rule was distinguished by justice and moderation, and that he devoted himself entirely to the duties of his office, without sharing in the intrigues which disgraced his family.[2]

Herod Agrippa.

The life of Herod Agrippa I., the grandson of Herod the Great, was marked by strange vicissitudes. Brought up at Rome, imprisoned by Tiberius for an unguarded speech,[3] he was released by Caligula, who gave him the territories formerly held by Philip and Lysanias, with the ensigns of royalty.[4] Afterwards, in return for important services rendered to Claudius,[5] he received not only the territory of Antipas, but the government of Judæa and Samaria, so that his entire dominions equalled in extent the kingdom of his grandfather. His zeal against the Church, and his persecution of the apostles, James and Peter, as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles,[1] seem at first sight to stand alone, as if they were sudden acts of bigoted hostility. But, as illustrated by the narrative of Josephus, they form parts of a settled policy. No sooner, we are there told, did he arrive at Jerusalem in A.D. 42, than he dedicated in the Temple the golden chain with which he had been presented by Caligula, and which was of equal weight with the iron one he had worn when imprisoned by Tiberius, and distinguished himself by the strictest profession of Judaism,[2] paying studious court to the Jews, and especially to the Pharisees. He offered sacrifice every day; paid the expenses of certain Nazarites on the completion of their vows; abstained from every legal impurity; remitted the house-tax of the inhabitants of the capital, and enriched the new suburb of Bezetha with a wall.[3] It is easy, therefore, to understand how such a king would be readily roused by the Jews, whom he was so anxious to please, to strike a deadly blow at "the Nazarenes." The accusations, which had been laid against Stephen, that the new Christian leader, St. James, spoke against the temple and the law, would be made with effect before such a

---

[1] Jos. *Ant.* xvii. 7, 2; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 9, 6.

[2] *Ant.* xviii. 2, 4; xviii. 5, 6.

[3] *Ibid.* xviii. 6. 7

[4] *Ibid.* xviii. 6. 10.

[5] *Bell. Jud.* ii. 11. 2. 3.

His Jewish zeal.

---

[1] Acts xii. 3.

[2] *Ant.* xix. 6, 1.

[3] *Ant.* xix. 6, 1.

zealous observer of Mosaic ritual as was Herod Agrippa.[1]

His sudden death.

The sudden death, also, of this monarch is strikingly illustrated by the Jewish historian. After he had reigned three years "over all Judæa,"[2] he came to Cæsarea A.D. 44, and "showed he could play the heathen there with as much zeal as he had played the Pharisee at Jerusalem."

The account of Josephus.

It was the occasion of a great festival, in honour, some have thought, of the return of Claudius in safety from his expedition to Britain.[3] On the second day,[4] at early dawn, he appeared in the theatre, and gave audience to an embassy from the Phœnician cities of Tyre and Sidon.[5] Arrayed in a royal robe of silver tissue of a truly wonderful contexture, he took his seat on the *bêma,* and made a set harangue to the Tyrians and Sidonians. The reflection of the sun's rays upon his gorgeous robe

> "spread a dread and shuddering over those who looked intently upon it, and," continues Josephus, "his flatterers

---

[1] The expression in Acts xii. 2, he slew James *with the sword,* is curiously illustrated by the Mishna. There we find it mentioned as the third of the modes of execution appointed amongst the Jews. "The ordinance for putting to death by the sword is as follows: the man's head is cut off with the sword, as is wont to be done by *royal command.*" See Professor Lumby's note on Acts xii. 2.

[2] Jos. *Ant.* xix. 8, 2.

[3] The "set day" of Acts xii. 21.

[4] Dion. lx. 23; Suet. *Claud.* 17.

[5] Acts xii. 20.

presently cried out, one from one place, and another from another, that he was a god. And they added, *Be thou merciful to us,* for although we have hitherto reverenced thee only as a man, yet shall we henceforth own thee *as superior to mortal nature.* Upon this the king *did neither rebuke them, nor reject their impious flattery.* But presently afterwards . . . a violent pain arose in his belly, having begun with great severity. He therefore looked upon his friends and said, 'I whom you call a god, am commanded presently to depart this life, while Providence thus reproves the lying words you just now said to me; and I who was called by you immortal, *am immediately to be hurried away by death.* But I am bound to accept what *Providence allots as it pleases God.*' When he had said this, his pain became violent. Accordingly, he was carried into the palace, and the rumour went abroad everywhere *that he would certainly die in a little time.* . . . And when he had been quite worn out with pain in his bowels for five days he departed this life."[1]

The points of contact between St. Luke and Josephus.

The points of contact in the two accounts, that of St. Luke and of the Jewish historian, are so striking that they deserve special attention. Josephus, who would fully sympathise with Agrippa, as one who did all he could for the Jews, and was in high favour with the Romans, "describes the form in which the king's malady made itself apparent at first, and has left out the more loathsome details from the death story of one who in his eyes was a great king." St. Luke, on the other hand, "has given the fuller account, because his object was to emphasize in all its enormity the sin, for which the Jewish historian tells us that Herod himself felt that he was stricken."

The difference between the two narratives is "so

---

[1] Jos. *Ant.* xix. 8, 2.

The difference slight and easily accountable.

slight and so easy to be accounted for, that this extract from Josephus must always be regarded as a most weighty testimony to the historic accuracy and faithfulness of St. Luke's narrative."[1]

Herod Agrippa II.

On the death of Herod Agrippa, Judæa, as we have already seen,[2] once more became a Roman province under Roman procurators. But a few years later, A.D. 50, the small kingdom of Chalcis was conferred by the Emperor Claudius on the son of Agrippa, Herod Agrippa II., who afterwards received other territories and the title of "king."[3] Josephus testifies to his intimacy with Festus;[4] and therefore it is not surprising that the Roman procurator should avail himself of the judgment of the Jewish prince as regards the perplexing questions of Jewish law urged against St. Paul.[5] The fondness of the Herods for show comes out in many passages of Josephus, and that Festus should have gratified Agrippa's love of display by a grand procession to the audience chamber, where Berenice could sit blazing with all her jewels, attended by a suite of followers in all the gorgeousness of Eastern pomp, is exactly what we should have expected. The remarks of Festus on the necessity of having some definite statement to send to Cæsar as regards the appeal, and their

The fondness of the Herods for show.

---

[1] Professor Lumby, on Acts xii. 23.

[2] See above p. 6.

[3] Acts xxv. 13.

[4] *Ant.* xx. 8, 11.

[5] Acts xxv. 16, 19.

Consistency of the narrative with known historical facts in other particulars

consistency with known historical facts, have been already alluded to. Equally consistent with historic fact is the remark of St. Paul, that he deemed himself happy in speaking before one who had received from his father an elaborate training in all matters of Jewish religion and casuistry.[1] No less consistent is the cold irony and contempt with which the Jewish king met the impassioned appeal of the Apostle, and his efforts to "persuade him off-hand" to be "a Christian."[2] The sneering banter chimes in with the temper of one who was resolved "to make the best of this world," and who, in the final struggle, like Josephus and other eminent renegades, sided with the conquerors of the nation,[3] and, after the fall of the Holy City, retired to Rome with the sensual Berenice, and "like Josephus, may have watched from a Roman window the gorgeous procession in which the victor paraded the sacred spoils of the Temple."

iv. THE CONDITION OF THE JEWISH NATION.

The moral and social condition of the Jews in New Testament times.

IN reference to the moral and social condition of the Jews at the period covered by the New Testament, whether we consider those who were settled in Palestine itself, or those who were dispersed throughout the Roman Empire, there is not a statement advanced but what is corroborated by Josephus.

---

[1] Acts xxvi. 2, 3. [2] Acts xxii. 28. [3] Jos. *Bell. Jud.* iii. 2, 4.

Foreign oppression had produced strict separation from Gentiles.

As for the Jews in Palestine itself, the national historian testifies that oppression under a foreign yoke, and especially the persecution of their religion by Antiochus Epiphanes, had produced amongst them a strict separation from all those that were not of the Elect Nation, thus inflaming their contempt and hatred for foreign customs, and at the same time raising to a high degree their national feelings and attachment to the religion of their forefathers.

Division into sects and the relations of sects to each other.

Josephus describes their division into sects, and the relations of these sects to each other.[1] A Pharisee himself, he tells us of the Pharisees, what we might infer from the Gospels, that they presented all the traits of the national character in a still more conspicuous degree, and were the most influential, especially with the common people;

The Pharisees.

that they attached the utmost importance to a traditional oral Law given to complete and explain the written Law;[2] that they were rigorous in exacting attention to all external ceremonials, especially washings, fastings, tithes, and alms; that they believed in a future state of rewards and punishments, and acknowledged the existence of angels and spirits; and that they were excessively zealous in making proselytes, and spared no efforts in winning over believers to their faith.

---

[1] *Ant.* xiii. 10, 5.

[2] Comp. Jos. *Ant.* xiii. 10, 6, with Matt. xv. 2 Mark vii. 3.

The Sadducees

As regards the Sadducees he not only distinctly recognises their existence, but places their beginning in the time of Jonathan, the successor of Judas Maccabeus, B.C. 160–143. He indicates that, while they had considerable influence in the Sanhedrin, they numbered their followers chiefly amongst the rich and influential youths of Judæa;[1] that they denied the resurrection of the dead,[2] a state of rewards and punishments, and the existence of angels and spiritual beings.

The Samaritans.

With respect to the *Samaritans*, Josephus agrees with the sacred narrative as regards their origin, and records that they were largely increased by fugitives from the neighbouring countries and by apostates and rebels against the order of things established by Ezra and Nehemiah;[3] that in the troublous times of Antiochus Epiphanes they escaped the fate of the Jews by repudiating all connection with Israel, and dedicating their temple on Mount Gerizim to Jupiter.[4] He relates many instances of the mutual animosity, which brought it about that "the Jews would have no dealings with the Samaritans[5];" how, in the time of Antiochus III., the Samaritans sold many Jews into slavery;[1] how they effected an entrance on one occasion into the temple on the eve of the Passover, and scattered human bones in the courts;[2] how on another they waylaid and set upon certain Galileans, whose "faces were set to go up to Jerusalem,"[3] and murdered a considerable number of them on the road.[4] The Jews, on the other hand, did not fall short in their recriminations, and in travelling from the south to the north they preferred to take the long circuit through Peræa, rather than pass through their hated country.[5]

---

[1] *Ant.* xviii. 1, 4: 10, 6.

[2] Comp. Matt. xxii. 23, with Jos. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8, 14; *Ant.* xviii. 1, 4.

[3] *Ant.* xi. 8, 2, 6, 7.

[4] *Ant.* xii. v. 5; Comp. 2 Mac. vi. 2.

[5] John iv. 4.

Testimony of Josephus.

The terms in which our Lord, and St. James after Him, rebuke the moral corruption of the national life find a striking counterpart in the language of Josephus:—

> "The period," he affirms, "had become so prolific in iniquity of every description amongst the Jews, that no work of evil was left unperpetrated; so universal was the contagion, both in public and private, and such the emulation to surpass each other in acts of impiety towards God, and of injustice towards their neighbours."[6] Such was the "impudence," he says in another place, "and boldness that had seized on the high priests, that they had the hardiness to send their servants into the threshing floors, to take away those tithes that were due to the priests; insomuch that it so fell out that the poorer sort of the priests died for want. To this degree did the violence of the seditious prevail over all right and justice."[7]

---

[1] *Ant.* xii. 4, 1.

[2] *Ant.* xviii. 2, 2.

[3] Luke ix. 51.

[4] *Ant.* xx. 6, 1.

[5] Trench on *The Parables*, p. 311.

[6] *Bell. Jud.* vii. 8, 1.

[7] *Ant.* xx. 8, 8.

Zeal for external religion.

At the same time he attests the existence of a great zeal for external religion, and a superstitious regard for the Temple and its hallowed associations, for the festivals prescribed by the Law, and the sacrifices commanded to be offered.[1] He describes the proneness of the people to take fire at the slightest insult being offered to their national honour or the sacredness of their national Sanctuary. The question of the lawfulness of paying "tribute to Cæsar,"[2] he affirms, led to the most violent disputes, and on the arrival of Quirinus in Judæa to carry out the imperial "census," a warm controversy sprang up as to the legality of the slightest submission to foreign taxation; Judas of Galilee declared such payment a direct violation of the Law, and it required the intervention of a considerable number of the chief men of the nation to induce the people to submit to the impost at all.[3] As regards the national Sanctuary and the City, not only did they resist the attempt of Pilate to introduce the silver eagles into Jerusalem,[4] and the insane proposition of Caligula to have his statue set up in the Temple,[5] but they would not allow even the younger Agrippa, though he was a friend of the nation, to raise the height of his house, lest he should command a view of the Temple courts.

Hatred of the Roman rule.

---

[1] *Ant.* xiii. 9, 3; xx. 4, 3.

[2] Matt. xxii. 17.

[3] *Ant.* xviii. 1.

[4] *Ant.* xviii. 3, 1.

[5] *Ant.* xviii. 8, 2.

They instantly ran up a wall to shut out the prospect; and when Festus commanded them to remove it, they declared they were ready to suffer any kind of death rather than permit even the slightest insult to be offered to their national Sanctuary, and appealed from him, when he was obdurate, to the emperor Nero, who allowed the wall to stand.[1]

Again do we read in the Acts of the Apostles how on one occasion, more than forty of the Jews bound themselves by "a curse, that they would neither eat nor drink" till they had killed St. Paul.[2] The Jewish historian relates an incident which is almost exactly parallel to it in the reign of Herod the Great. So exasperated, he tells us, were many against the king for violating the laws of the country that ten men bound themselves by an oath to put him to death. Arming themselves with short daggers, which they hid under their clothes, they made their way into the theatre, where they expected him to arrive, intending, if he came, to fall upon him and despatch him with their weapons.[3] Obtaining information of the plot, Herod condemned the conspirators to the most cruel tortures. But so far from being affrighted, they affirmed they were quite ready to undergo anything he might be disposed to inflict, and patiently submitted to the most terrible torments.

Fanaticism.

---

[1] *Ant.* xx. 8, 11. [2] Acts xxiii. 12. [3] *Ant.* xv. 8, 3, 4.

How little the spectacle affected the people is proved by the fact that they seized the traitor who revealed the plot, and tore him limb from limb, and flung the fragments to the dogs.[1] Again, just at the close of his life, certain daring youths, at the instigation of two of the most learned Rabbis, Judas and Matthias, resolved at all hazards to cut down the large golden eagle, the emblem of Roman power, which Herod had placed over the principal gate of the Temple. Armed with hatchets, they lowered themselves by thick ropes from the roof and cut away the obnoxious emblem. Being brought before Herod, they boldly avowed the deed, and gloried in its success, declaring that the Law of their country bound them to do and dare everything for their religion, and smiled at the sentence which condemned them to be burnt alive.[2]

The attempt to cut down the golden eagle.

Do we trace again in the New Testament a confident expectation of the coming of a Deliverer in the person of the Messiah? Do we find Zacharias and Elizabeth,[3] Simeon and Anna,[4] the woman of Samaria,[5] and the rulers of the nation, alike animated by this belief? Not only does Josephus testify that during the Roman war[6] there was a general expectation amongst the Jews, founded upon the prophecies of the Old Testament, that one of their

Expectation of the Messiah.

---

[1] *Ant.* xv. 8, 4.
[2] *Ant.* xvii. 6, 3.
[3] Luke i. 13.
[4] Luke ii. 25, 36.
[5] John iv. 25.
[6] *Bell. Jud.* vi. 5, 4.

Testimony of Tacitus and Suetonius.

own race and country should obtain the empire of the world, but Tacitus and Suetonius affirm that a reflection of this prophecy had become prevalent in the East. Suetonius asserts that

> "for a long time there had been a rumour in circulation throughout the Orient, that one rising out of Judæa was destined to sway the world."[1]

Tacitus expresses himself almost in the self-same words, adding that the prediction was found in certain writings of the priests, and that it assured the empire of the earth to one sprung from the Jewish stock.[2]

The Jews of the Dispersion.

So much for the Jews in Palestine. But there were also the Jews "of the Dispersion."[3] How wide this dispersion was may be judged from the enumeration given of the witnesses of the bestowal of the Holy Spirit on the Day of Pentecost. We find there mentioned—

> "Parthians, and Medes, and Elamites, and dwellers in Mesopotamia and Judæa and Cappadocia, Pontus and Asia, Phrygia and Pamphylia, Egypt, and the parts of Libya about Cyrene, strangers of Rome, Cretes, and Arabians."[4]

In the course, also, of the travels of St. Paul, whether he is in Asia Minor or Greece, we find him coming across large bodies of Jewish residents at Antioch[5] and Ephesus,[6] at Philippi[7] and Thessalonica,[8] at Athens[9] and Corinth.[10]

---

[1] Suet. *Oct.* 94; *Vesp.* 4.
[2] Tac. *Hist.* v. 13.
[3] John vii. 35; James i. 1; 1 Pet. i. 1.
[4] Acts ii. 9–11.
[5] Acts xiii. 14.
[6] Acts xix. 10.
[7] Acts xvi. 12.
[8] Acts xvii. 1.
[9] Acts xvii. 17.
[10] Acts xviii. 4.

What light do historical writers throw upon these facts? Curtius tells us that Alexander the Great located great numbers of the chosen people in his new city of Alexandria. Josephus testifies that Seleucus Nicator invited them to Antioch,[1] and that Antiochus the Great removed 2000 Jewish families from Babylon to Lydia and Phrygia.[2]

Letter of Herod Agrippa to Caligula.

> "The holy city, the place of my nativity,"

writes Herod Agrippa I. to Caligula,[3]

> "is the metropolis, not of Judæa only, but of well nigh every other country, by means of the colonies which have been sent out of it from time to time—some to the neighbouring countries of Egypt, Phœnicia, Syria, and Cœle-Syria—some to more distant regions, as Pamphylia, Cilicia, Asia as far as Bithynia, and the recesses of Pontus; and in Europe, Thessaly, Bœotia, Macedonia, Œolia, Attica, Argos, Corinth, together with the most famous of the islands, Eubœa, Cyprus, and Crete; to say nothing of those who dwell beyond the Euphrates. For, excepting a small part of the Babylonian and other satrapies, all the countries which have a fertile territory, possess Jewish inhabitants, so that if thou shalt show this kindness to my native place, thou wilt benefit not one city only, but thousands in every region of the world, in Europe, in Asia, in Africa,—on the continents, and in the islands,—on the shores of the sea, and in the interior."[4]

Their national peculiarities.

So much for the extent of their dispersion. As for the national peculiarities which they retain in the lands whither they are scattered, these too are abundantly illustrated. As we find them described in the New Testament, so we find them in the pages of Josephus and Philo, of Horace and Juvenal, of Tacitus and Suetonius. In these writers we come across them as in the Acts, partly as native Jews, partly as proselytes;[1] they have their places of worship, sometimes called synagogues, sometimes "proseuchæ,"[2] or oratories, either by the seaside[3] or the banks of a river. At Jerusalem, the Jews of the "Diaspora" have a synagogue specially assigned to them, and at Rome they appropriate a whole quarter.

---

[1] Jos. *Ant.* xii. 3, 1.

[2] *Ant.* xii. 3, 3.

[3] As reported by Philo Judæus, *Legat. ad Caium.* pp. 1031, 1032, quoted by Rawlinson, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 248.

[4] Comp. also Philo *in Flacc*, p., 971, E.

The Jewish quarter at Rome.

v. THE GREEK AND ROMAN WORLD.

The Greek and the Roman world.

BUT it is not in reference only to Palestine and the elect nation that we notice the conspicuous accuracy of the writers of the New Testament. It comes out also with equally striking force in their description of the Greek and Roman world.

Thus, let us follow St. Paul to any of the places which he visited during his missionary journeys, we find the scenes described fully illustrated sometimes by the actual words of classical poets and historians, sometimes by ancient coins and the inscriptions on ancient monuments.

---

[1] Jos. *Ant.* xx. 2; *Bell. Jud.* vii. 3.

[2] Comp. Juv. Sat. iii. 279.

[3] In the decree of the Helicarnassians, as reported by Josephus, *Antiq.* xiv. 10, 23, Jews are allowed to construct oratories (*proseuchæ*) by the seaside, according to the custom of their nation.

Sergius Paulus.

Thus let us follow him to Cyprus, where he landed on his first missionary journey. From Salamis, on the eastern coast, he makes his way to Paphos, at the south-western extremity of the island, the seat of the Roman Government, and the residence of the governor, Sergius Paulus. What is the title the writer gives to him? He calls him a *proconsul*.[1] Is this correct? At first we might think not, for Dio Cassius tells us that originally it was an imperial province, and therefore governed by a *proprætor* or *legatus*.[2] But after awhile we find that Augustus restored Cyprus to the senate in exchange for Dalmatia,[3] from which time forward its governors were *proconsuls*. The sacred writer, therefore, is quite correct, and he is still further confirmed by an extant Cyprian coin of the reign of Claudius *which bears this title*, and an inscription which has been found supplying us with the names of two additional governors of the island, who likewise bear the title of *proconsul*.

His title

Achaia and Asia.

The same title, with equal correctness, is applied to the governors of the provinces of "Achaia,"[4] and Roman "Asia,"[5] both of which Dio Cassius places amongst senatorial provinces. But the same authority, supported by Strabo, affirms that

---

[1] Acts. xiii. 7. [2] Dio Cassius, liii. 12. [3] Dion lix. 4.
[4] Acts xviii. 12. [5] Acts xix. 38.

Syria.

Syria, which the Apostle had just left before sailing to Cyprus, was an imperial province, and therefore governed by a *proprætor*. Now, on turning to the narrative in the Acts, what do we find? No such title as *proconsul* is ever applied by the sacred writer to Quirinus, the governor of Syria, or to Pilate, Felix, and Festus, the procurators of Judæa, which was a dependency of that great and unsettled province.

Antioch in Pisidia.

Proceeding from Cyprus to Asia Minor, the Apostle reaches Antioch in Pisidia.[1] This town, being of considerable importance, had been advanced by Augustus, like Alexandria - Troas[2] and Philippi,[3] to the dignity of a Roman *colony*. Originally designed as military safeguards of the frontiers and to check insurgent provincials, Roman colonies were miniature resemblances of the imperial city and parts of the fortifications of the empire. The title of *proconsul* would have been utterly inapplicable to the governor of a Roman colony, and the writer of the Acts *never so uses it*. At the Pisidian Antioch those in authority are termed "the chiefs of the city."[4] At Philippi, St. Paul and his companions are dragged into the market-place before "the rulers,"[5] and this general term not being sufficient, the special members of the magistracy are indicated in the next verse by

Roman colonies.

---

[1] Acts xiii. 14. [2] Acts xvi. 8. [3] Acts xvi. 12.
[4] Acts xiii. 50. [5] Acts xvi. 20.

the title "prætors."[1] These were the "duumviri," specially appointed, as Cicero tells us, to preside over the administration of justice, in cases where there was no appeal to Rome, in *the colonies of the empire*, who, like the one described in Horace,[2] at Tivoli, arrogate to themselves the title of "prætors." When some Greek title was necessary, as at Philippi, the term στράτηγοι, *strategi*, would naturally be accepted, and this is the exact term employed in the Acts.[3]

Philippi.

Everything that befell the Apostle at Philippi reminds us that we are in a Roman "colony." The Jews, with the contemptuous religious tolerance of the period, are allowed to have their *proseucha* or "place of prayer" outside the gate.[4] The "prætors" command that the Apostle and his companions be beaten with "the rods"[5] of the Roman lictor; and the use of this particular word is an indication that St. Luke was aware of this special kind of scourging, and perhaps beheld the infliction. The "inner prison," into which the prisoners are thrust, foul and loathsome, and probably underground, recalls the Tullianum of the

The lictors.

The inner prison.

---

[1] See the Revised Version in the margin of Acts xvi. 20, 21.

[2] Hor. *Sat.* i. 5, 34.

[3] Acts xv. 20, 22, 35, 36, 38.

[4] Acts xvi. 13, see above, p. 44.

[5] Acts xvi. 22. This is one of the occasions, no doubt, to which St. Paul alludes, 2 Cor. xi. 25: "Thrice was I *beaten with rods*."

capital.[1] The "stocks" wherewith their limbs are confined, are what the Romans called *nervus*, which we often find mentioned in Roman Comedy.[2] The duumviri, alarmed by the earthquake, send on the following morning their servants[3] to release the prisoners. St. Paul pleads that he and his companions have been publicly scourged, without any form of trial and uncondemned, in direct violation of Roman law, a violation which, even in the instance of the Catilinarian conspirators, brought so much odium upon Cicero.[4] He still further insists that their rights as Roman citizens have been infringed;[5] and the prætors, alarmed at what they had done, and dreading exposure before the Emperor, whom all fear, hasten to the prisoners, and beg them to depart from the city, and the Apostle realizes the truth of Cicero's words:—

Privileges of Roman citizens.

> "How often has this exclamation, *I am a Roman citizen*, brought aid and safety even among barbarians in the remotest part of the earth."[6]

Thus the political atmosphere of the Roman colony is wholly Roman.

"Nor," it has been observed,[7] "is this feature entirely lost sight of, when we turn from St. Luke's narrative to St. Paul's Epistle. Addressing a Roman colony from the Roman metropolis, writing as a citizen to citizens, he recurs to the political franchise as an apt symbol of the higher privileges of their heavenly calling, to the political life as a suggestive metaphor for the duties of their Christian profession."[1]

---

[1] Livy, xxix. 22.

[2] Plaut. *Capt.* iii. 5, 71.

[3] The lictors, "rod-bearers," who had scourged the Apostle the day before.

[4] Cic. *ad Fam.* v. 2.

[5] Acts xvi. 39.

[6] Cic. *in Verrem*, v. 66.

[7] Bishop Lightfoot's *Commentary on the Philippians*, p. 51.

The political franchise.

Very striking is the contrast between the political allusions at Philippi and those at Thessalonica, which the Apostle visits so soon after his release. Thessalonica is not a Roman colony, but a "free city" like Tarsus, the Syrian Antioch, Ephesus, and Athens. Here the political atmosphere is not so wholly Roman. The town contains the chief synagogue of the Jews in this part of Macedonia, while the Greek proselytes and the influential women are conspicuous. The Jews, furious at the spread of the obnoxious tenets of the Apostle, gather together a throng of idlers from the rabble,[2] throw the town into an uproar, and falling upon the house of Jason, where the Apostle was lodging, seek to drag him and his companion before "the assembly of the people," or "the Demos." The occurrence of this term shows the historic truthfulness of the narrative. The general characteristics of a "free city" are maintained. But besides "the

Thessalonica.

The Demos.

---

[1] Comp. Phil. i. 27: "*Only behave as citizens* worthily of the Gospel of Christ," R. V., margin; Phil. iii. 20, "Our citizenship is in heaven."

[2] Acts xvii. 5.

Demos," the town has its supreme magistrates. Who are these? Had the writer termed them "proconsuls" or "proprætors," he would have involved himself in a considerable error. But he does nothing of the kind. He calls them "Politarchs," a title not found in books from which an impostor might have gathered the fact. Is he, then, guilty of any mistake? Evidence found only on ancient monuments, and accidentally brought to light in modern times, attests his fidelity to facts. An inscription still legible on an archway in Thessalonica gives this very title "politarchs" to the magistrates of the place, informs us of their number, and mentions the names of some who bore the office not long before the day of St. Paul. Thus the title, as corroborated by monumental history, is perfectly correct. And what is the charge urged before these magistrates against the Apostle? Nothing is heard of religious ceremonies, which the citizens, *being Romans,* may not lawfully adopt.[1] All the anxiety both of people and magistrates is turned to the one point of showing their loyalty to the Emperor.[2] No lictors with rods and fasces appear upon the scene, as at Philippi, to execute the command of Roman officers.

The Politarchs.

Zeal for Cæsar.

---

[1] Acts xvi. 21.

[2] Acts xvii. 7. The Julian laws had greatly extended the sweep of the charge of Treason, which charge Tacitus tells us, "then crowned all indictments." Tac. *Ann.* iii. 38.

A mixed mob of Greeks and Jews are anxious to show themselves "Cæsar's friends;" and when they have "taken security" of Jason for his good conduct, they are satisfied to let the accused go free.

Athens.

From Thessalonica let us accompany the Apostle to Athens. Here it is said of him that

> "his spirit was provoked within him, as he beheld the city full of idols."[1]

The temples

Classical authors illustrate to the full the fact here stated. Pausanias, who visited the city about fifty years after the Apostle, tells us how, at the very entrance of the Peiraic Gateway, temples of the gods confronted the traveller, here one sacred to Neptune, there one to Minerva, there a third to Ceres. On passing the gate the eye rested on the sculptured forms of many deities, while on entering the Agora and looking up to the Areopagus, or forward towards the Acropolis, a series of sanctuaries were visible. The Areopagus itself might be called, in the words of Xenophon,

> "one entire altar, sacrifice, and votive offering to the gods;"

The idols

and it is plain that the Roman satirist hardly exaggerated, when he said it was

> "easier to find a god at Athens than a man."[2]

But we are confronted not merely with the religion, but the philosophy of Greece. The Epicureans, with one of whom Cicero lodged on the occasion

---

[1] Acts xvii. 16.

[2] Comp. also Livy xlv. 29.

The Philosophers. of his visit to the city, and the Stoics, whose "painted Cloister" figures in the writings of Lucian, encounter the Apostle. They convey him to the Areopagus, and with that national curiosity to learn the latest novelty, which Cleon[1] charges against his countrymen, and Demosthenes[2] alludes to in more than one of his orations, desire to know what were the strange doctrines which the Apostle taught, and the strange gods whom he announced. With singular tact the Apostle, taking "the pebble out of their own brook," to use the words of Chrysostom, makes an inscription on an altar which the Athenians had erected to "an Unknown God," a text for his discourse, and proclaims to them Him whom they ignorantly worshipped. **The Unknown God.** We have abundant evidence of the existence at Athens of such altars as the Apostle describes. Treating of one of the ports of Athens Pausanias affirms[3] that there were three "altars to gods styled unknown," and in this agrees Philostratus in his life of Apollonius.[4] Thus few as are the verses in the Acts containing a description of the Athenians, and of their city, the incidental allusions are singularly truthful, and very skilfully portray the leading features of Athenian character.

---

[1] Thuc. iii. 38.

[2] Philipp. i. 4, 5. He complains that his countrymen were in the habit of playing the part of spectators in displays of oratory, and listeners to stories of what others had done."

[3] Pausanias i. 1, 4.

[4] He says, "at Athens there are erected altars for *unknown* gods." Professor Lumby quotes a Latin inscription on an altar at Ostia, now in the Vatican, "Signum indeprehensibilis dei," which is very like the inscription alluded to by the Apostle.

Ephesus.

The sacred writer moves with equal ease and freedom when he describes the tumult in the Ephesian capital of Roman Asia. Coins current at the date, when the Acts of the Apostles was written, and now existing, are stamped with the image of the Ephesian Artemis, the prolific "mother of life," the presiding deity of the famous temple in the city, often described by classical historians as one of "the wonders of the world." Inscriptions, brought to light by recent explorations,[1] contain the remarkable title of **Νεώκορος**, applied to Ephesus as "the Guardian of the shrine of her, whose image was reported to have fallen down from heaven." Little models of her shrine, we further learn from classical authors, were made by the silversmiths, and worn as ornaments and amulets; while mysterious symbols, called "Ephesian letters," copied from the inscriptions on various parts of the image, were deemed a safeguard against demons and all kinds of evil. But the sacred historian is also equally accurate as regards the political status of the city. Ephesus, as we have seen,[2] was a "free city," and it retained even under the Romans its old democratic constitution, and Josephus quotes a letter of Dolabella to "the

The Temple of Artemis.

Silver shrines.

Political details.

---

[1] See Wood's *Ephesus*.

[2] See above p. 49.

senate, magistrates, and *people* of the Ephesians." In strict accordance with this we find "the proconsuls" spoken of, and "the town-clerk," or "recorder," and the Asiarchs, who like the œdiles at Rome, presided over the games, and held a kind of sacerdotal position. The tumult in the theatre, the disorderly cries of the rabble, the business-like address of the town-clerk, the allusion to the assize courts, the fear of the displeasure of the Roman government, all these minute and incidental touches are consistent alike with each other, and with contemporary historical and monumental illustrations.

Minute incidental touches true to history and monuments.

Rome.

Or if we turn to the great capital of the West, how true are the incidental allusions to the details of life there, and the imperial system! Every step the Apostle takes after reaching Puteoli, the great emporium of the Alexandrian cornships, as a letter of the philosopher Seneca attests, lies through scenes immortalised in classic history, which no writer of a feigned narrative would have dared to press into his service. The courteous centurion [1] delivers up his charge on his arrival at the imperial city, and the favourable way in which he could speak of him doubtless contributed to the fact that he was kept separate from the rest of the prisoners, and allowed to take up his abode in a hired house, with the soldier to whom he was chained.[1] What contradiction can be alleged here with classical writers? Seneca[2] and Tacitus[3] alike inform us that according to the rules of the *custodia militaris*, a species of custody introduced at the commencement of the Empire, prisoners were commonly fastened by a chain passed from their right wrist to the left wrist of their keeper. Intolerably irksome as confinement with this "coupling-chain" must have been, and for a Jew far more painful than for a Gentile, the Apostle "redeemed the time," and converted even his bonds into an occasion of making known his cause and the message of the Gospel to the various soldiers, to whom in succession he was chained day after day, and night after night.[4] What was the result? The "Word" found its way to the imperial guards, the prætorian regiments, and into "Cæsar's household."[5] Does Tacitus contradict this as an impossibility? He distinctly tells[6] us that Tiberius, in his capacity of "prætor," or commander-in-chief, concentrated the

---

[1] The centurions mentioned in the New Testament are uniformly spoken of in terms of praise, whether in the Gospels or the Acts. It is interesting to compare this with the statements of Polybius (vi. 24), that the centurions were chosen by merit, and so are men remarkable, not so much for their daring courage, as for their *deliberation*, *constancy*, and *strength of mind;* who not eager in beginning a battle, would keep their ground, however hardly pressed, and determine to die rather than leave their post.

Custodia militaris.

An ambassador in bonds.

Cæsar's household.

---

[1] Acts xxviii. 16.

[2] *De Tranquill* 10; *Epist.* 5.

[3] Tac. *Ann.* iv. 28.

[4] Farrar's *St. Paul*, ii. 391.

[5] Phil. i. 13; iv. 22.

[6] Tac. *Ann.* iv. 2.

cohorts of the prætorian guards outside the Colline gate at the north east of the city. And as for the "household of Cæsar,"[1] the sepulchral columbaria, which late researches have laid bare at Rome, have illustrated in a most striking manner the number and the variety of the employments of the thousands of slaves and freedmen included in the "Domus Augusta." Nay, several of the names found amongst those in these exhumed recesses, occur also in the long list of friends saluted by St. Paul some three years before in his Epistle to the Romans;[2] and if we assume with Bishop Lightfoot that the Epistle to the Philippians[3] was written soon after the arrival of the Apostle in the metropolis, the members of Cæsar's household, who send their salutations to Philippi, may be looked for in the same catalogue, and illustrated by the same monumental testimony.

Testimony of the columbaria.

---

[1] Phil. iv. 22.

[2] In Rom. xvi. 8, we have *Amplias,* a contraction of Ampliatus. The Columbaria gives amongst those in the imperial household AMPLIATVS. HILARI. AUGUSTOR. LIBERTI. SERV. VILICUS; *Urbanus.* TI. CLAVDI. VRBANI SER. MENSORIS. ÆDIFCIORVM; *Stachys.* STACHYS. MARCELLÆ. MEDICVS; *Tryphœna.* D. M. TRYPHENÆ. VALERIA. TRYPHENA. MATRI. B. M. F. ET VALERIVS. FVTIANVS, and so with many others. See Lightfoot's *Philippians*, pp. 172–174.

[3] Lightfoot's *Philippians*, p. 171.

vi. General Conclusion.

Evidential value of these historical illustrations

The historical illustrations, which it has been possible to review within the compass of this Tract, are a few out of many that might be brought forward. But when we look back even upon the short course that we have traversed, we have seen enough to convince us of their evidential value. There is no disputing the fact that short as is the period covered by the writers of the New Testament, it falls strictly within the domain of history, and abounds in the most complicated phases of the political, moral, social, and religious life of the Jewish nation, and could not fail to have occasioned the greatest perplexity to an ordinary narrator.

Their perfect naturalness

There is no disputing also the fact that the writers of the New Testament handle these phases with an absence of all strain or effort. They "move easily and freely in their armour," and allude incidentally and naturally to numberless little incidents, bound up with special times, occasions, and circumstances, each having its own local or national or religious or political colouring, each marked by the most precise and graphic touches, which no marvellous skill of adjustment, and no perfection of artistic power, in that or any other age, could have elaborated, unless they were dealing with strictly historical facts, and as true men were dealing truly with actual events occurring in their own times.

Their incompatibility with an untrue narrative.

There have been, it must be allowed, signal triumphs won by the genius of poetic and literary imagination. But in all literature there is no other instance of the existence of a number of separate and independent documents bound up in a single volume, relating to an historical period, which had its records, its archives, and its monuments, and purporting to give an account of events occurring within that period, that can be shown to teem with such minute and truthful incidental allusions to facts, at first sight of the most insignificant import, but which on examination are found to have momentous bearing on those events.

Every quotation from Josephus, Tacitus, or Suetonius, every fresh archæological exploration in Palestine, Asia Minor, or Greece, only serves to illustrate the minute accuracy with which their titles are given to Roman procurators and proconsuls, Greek "politarchs," and Asiatic œdiles, and to demonstrate the fidelity with which dual systems of government, of military forces, of capital punishment, of language, and of religious life, are described as blended together and co-existing side by side, at the only period when that co-existence was possible, amongst the strangest of all strange people, the Jewish nation, whether living in its own land, or scattered throughout the Roman empire.

They tend to establish the truth of the Gospel story.

When we find these numberless incidental allusions receiving such striking and unexpected confirmation, we are placed in possession of another link in the chain of evidence, which convinces us of the reality of the historical foundation on which Christianity rests, and the truth of the Gospel Story.

The attestation by classical authors certain and indisputable even had the New Testament never been written.

That Story is in its outline attested by Classical authors of repute, and this attestation remains certain and indisputable, *even supposing the New Testament had never been written at all.* We must destroy the *Annals* of Tacitus, the *Lives* of Suetonius, the *Letters* of Pliny, if we wish to get rid of their testimony that in the reign of the Emperor Tiberius one called Christ existed;[1] that Judæa was the place of His teaching; that He was put to death at the command of Pontius Pilate;[1] that in spite of His death, His doctrines rapidly spread throughout the Roman world;[1] that they attracted a vast number of converts; that, in consequence, the ancient sacrificial system gradually disappeared; that the Christians worshipped Christ as a God;[2] and for His sake suffered cruel persecution.[3]

The most truly miraculous thing of all

But what fact is more miraculous in the true sense of the word, than this, that the three short years of the life of Him, whose career was thus cut short by a cruel and infamous death should have sent forth an influence which has changed the face of the Western world, and that His Personality should be at this moment the most potent force in the present age?

---

[1] Tac. *Ann.* xv. 44. [2] Pliny's *Letter to Trajan*, x. 97.

[3] Tac. *Ann.* xv. 44; Suet. *Neron.* 16.

Conclusion. Is it possible to believe that the narrative of His Life, Death, Resurrection, and Ascension, and of the foundation of His Church, which at this moment notoriously exists, could have been described by the writers of the New Testament with a wealth of incidental allusions to the most complicated political and historical facts, attested in many of the minutest particulars alike by classical historians, and by monumental and numismatic inscriptions, and *at the same time be untrue?* Is this conceivable?

There can be but one answer to the question. Once grant that "the signs,"[1] which our Lord is said to have "wrought," He did truly perform "in the presence of His disciples," and that He is "the Christ, the Son of God,"[1] and we have a consistent explanation of the records and of the Divine Person, whose life and ministry the Evangelists portray On any other supposition, the existence of the New Testament Scriptures, thus singularly confirmed from so many unexpected quarters, presents us with a literary phenomenon unparalleled in the history of the world.

---

[1] John xx. 30, 31.

POINTS OF CONTACT

BETWEEN

REVELATION AND NATURAL SCIENCE

BY

SIR J. WILLIAM DAWSON, C.M.G., LL.D., F.R.S.

Argument of the Tract.

There are many important points in which the history and doctrine of the Word of God come into close contact with the results of modern scientific investigation, or with theories and deductions based on these results; and it often happens, that, owing to want of acquaintance with one or other, well-meaning persons are led to believe that the word and the works of God are at variance with each other. It is the purpose of the present Tract to illustrate the harmony of the two records at their points of contact, and for this purpose the following topics have been selected:

(1) The General Nature of Creation; (2) The Origin and Early History of Man; (3) The Edenic State; (4) Body, Soul, and Spirit; (5) The Fall of Man; (6) The Antediluvians; (7) Primitive Social Institutions; (8) The Origin of Religion; (9) Natural Theology. It is shown that on all of these subjects there is an essential unity in the teaching of Natural Science and that of Revelation.

POINTS OF CONTACT BETWEEN REVELATION AND NATURAL SCIENCE.

THE trite saying that the Bible was not intended to teach science, is one of those superficial truths often used to cover much ignorance. It is no doubt true that in so far as science deals with the proximate causes of natural processes and classifies the objects of nature under general theoretical ideas, it has no connection with the Bible, since the latter refers all to the primary creative cause, and indulges in no theories and makes no formal classifications. On the other hand, no book, not directly relating to physical science, has more frequent reference to natural facts and laws, and commits itself more definitely to certain doctrines as to the origin of the world and things therein. Farther, in so far as science and philosophy deal with origins and historical order, they enter on a field which revelation has to some extent occupied, and this more

The Bible refers all to a primary creative cause.

Frequent reference to natural facts and laws in the Bible.

The Bible deals with origins and historical order.

especially in connection with the origin and early history of man himself. It is also true that when some interpreters of the Bible have ventured to adopt certain scientific and philosophical hypotheses and to connect them with revelation, or when they have undertaken to combat these as opposed to the Word of God, they have often quite unwarrantably established alliances and antagonisms between interpretations more or less accurate of the two records of God in His Word and in His works. On the other hand, many speculations connected with science have been pressed into the service of Atheism and other forms of infidelity. It is the purpose of the present Tract to indicate some of the legitimate points of contact between science and revelation, more especially in relation to questions connected with the history of man as studied by the sciences of geology and archæology.

Unwarrantable use of scientific and philosophical hypotheses.

GENERAL NOTIONS OF CREATION.

We may first examine the Biblical doctrine of creation in its relation to scientific fact and theory. The Bible opens with an explicit statement on this subject, which forms the basis of the whole of its subsequent teaching: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." It offers no proof of this statement, but places it before us as an initial dogma, to be accepted by faith without

The statement of the Bible with reference to creation.

any direct evidence. Has science anything to say as to our acceptance or rejection of this primary dogma? It can offer no proof or disproof, but can merely inquire if the statement is one admitting of any rational alternative. It is, however, a complex statement, and may be divided into its constituent parts. First, as to a "beginning:"—Can Science regard the duration of the heavens and the earth as infinite? It cannot, for when we interrogate it as to the particular things known to constitute the earth and the heavens, it appears that we can trace all of them to beginnings at more or less definite points of past time. Then as to a producing cause:—If we cannot say that all things have existed from eternity, how did they begin? Science forbids us to say that it was by mere chance, for order and system cannot come of chance, nor has chance the power to initiate anything; and it would be the height of absurdity for investigators occupied solely with the study of causes and effects to admit that the universe is causeless. Nor will science allow us to say that things made themselves, or are their own causes. The only alternative is that they were made by some external power, and any power which could contrive and execute all the complex machinery of the heavens and the earth, or could initiate anything capable of developing such machinery, must be practically

Constituent parts of the statement.

A beginning.

A producing cause.

The only alternative.

infinite, and must possess those attributes of superhuman power and superhuman wisdom which belong only to God. Thus the first sentence of the Bible lays the foundation of a rational and scientific Theism, by the statement of a proposition which we must accept, because we cannot rationally substitute anything for it.

The foundation of a rational and scientific Theism laid in the Bible.

If the Bible had opened with the statement, "The heavens and the earth had no beginning;" or, "In the beginning the heavens and the earth were self-created," or, "We cannot know by what power the heavens and the earth were created," the man of science, on reading these words, might indeed have closed the book, saying, it is useless to read any further. At a time when Agnosticism and Materialism claim that they are results of science, it is well for us to note that neither can supply any rational formula to replace this fundamental doctrine of revelation.

The Bible statement implies a personal creative will as the origin of all things.

But the opening statement of the Bible implies a personal creative will as the origin of all things. Now it so happens that all our own actions and motions, the only things of whose ultimate cause we have any direct knowledge, proceed from this kind of force, this energy of energies, which we call will or volition. Whatever machinery we may discover in muscle or nerve or brain-cell, we come at last to the primary motive-power of will, and we can no more divest ourselves of the belief of this than of that of our own existence and personality. So in nature, we can see no ultimate cause for anything except an Almighty creative will, and this implies a Person to whom it belongs. Thus the formula "God created" embraces all that science can in the last resort know of the origin of the universe. It is true that science can know this only by analogy, the analogy of the microcosm of man with the macrocosm of the universe, but beyond this analogy it has nothing to say. It is impossible, with reference to this ultimate result of the study of forces, to improve on the words of Sir William Grove, the author of the work which first opened up to the English-speaking world the great doctrine of the correlation of forces. After showing that neither matter nor force can be created or annihilated by us, and that an essential cause is unattainable by physical science, he concludes that "Causation is the will, creation the act, of God."

The formula "God created" embraces all that science can know, in the last resort, of the origin of the universe.

Sir William Grove's statement of the truth.

If we pass from the primary act of creation to consider its order and method, science and sound philosophy may still find themselves in harmony with revelation. The unity of nature as a single harmonious system, regulated in all its parts by definite laws, follows of necessity from our attributing it to the will of one almighty Author, and this grand monotheistic generalization not only dispels the mists and darkness of many

The unity of nature follows from attributing it to one almighty will.

baneful superstitions, but opens the way for science to enter on the conquest of the material universe. In like manner, the order of that vision of the creative work with which the Bible begins its history, is so closely in harmony with the results worked out by geological investigations, that the correspondences have excited marked attention, and have been justly regarded as establishing the common authorship of nature and revelation. If again we look at the details of the narrative of creation, we shall be equally struck with the manner in which the Bible includes in a few simple words all the leading causes and conditions which science has been able to discover. For example, the production of the first animals is announced in the words, "God said let the waters swarm with swarmers."[1] A naturalist here recognises not only the origination of animal life in the waters, but also three powers or agencies concerned in its introduction, or rather perhaps one power and two conditions of its exercise. First, there are the Divine power and volition contained in the words "God said;" secondly, there is a medium, or environment previously prepared and essential to the production of the result—"the waters;" thirdly, there is the element of vital continuity in the term "swarmers,"—that reproductive element

The order of the creative work given in the Bible in harmony with the results of geological investigations.

The powers and agencies concerned in the introduction of anima. life.

---

[1] This is perhaps the best word to express the meaning of th word *Sheretzim*—rapidly multiplying creatures.

which hands down the organism with all its powers from generation to generation, from age to age. If we ask modern science what are the agencies and conditions implied in the introduction on the earth of the multitudinous forms of humble marine life which we find in the oldest rocks, its answer is in no essential respect different. It says that these creatures, endowed with powers of reproduction and possibly of variation, increased and multiplied and filled the waters with varied forms of life; in other words, they were "sheretzim," or swarmers. It further says that their oceanic environment supplied the external conditions of their introduction and continuance, and all the varieties of station suited to their various forms—"the waters brought them forth." Lastly, since biology cannot show any secondary cause adequate to produce out of dead matter even the humblest of these swarmers, it must here either confess its ignorance, and say that it knows nothing of such "abiogenesis,"[1] or must fall back on the old formula, "God said."

The account given by science in no respect different.

Let it be further observed that creation or making, as thus stated in the Bible, is not of the nature of what some are pleased to call an arbitrary intervention and miraculous interference with the course of nature. It leaves quite open the inquiry

Creation no arbitrary intervention and interference with the course of nature.

---

[1] It is sometimes urged against the idea of creation that it implies abiogenesis or production without previous life. But there must have been abiogenesis at some time, and probably more than once, else no living thing could have existed.

how much of the vital phenomena which we perceive may be due to the absolute creative fiat, to the prepared environment, or to the reproductive power. The creative work is itself a part of Divine law, and this in a threefold aspect: First, the law of the Divine will or purpose; second, the laws impressed on the medium or environment; third, the laws of the organism itself, and of its continuous multiplication, either with or without modifications.

The creative work part of Divine law.

While the Bible does not commit itself to any hypotheses of evolution, it does not exclude these up to a certain point. It even intimates in the varying formulæ "created," "made," "formed," caused to "bring forth," that different kinds of living beings may have been introduced in different ways, only one of which is entitled to be designated by the higher term "create." The scientific evolutionist may, for instance, ask whether different species, when introduced, may not under the influence of environment change in process of time, or by sudden transitions, into new forms not distinguishable by us from original products of creation. Such questions may never admit of any certain or final solution, but they resemble in their nature those of the chemist, when he asks how many of the kinds of matter are compounds produced by the union of simple substances, and how many are elementary and can be no further

The varying formulæ used in the Bible may imply varying modes of introducing different living beings.

decomposed. If the chemist has to recognize say sixty substances as elementary, these are to him manufactured articles, products of creation. If he should be able to reduce them to a much smaller number, even ultimately to only one kind of matter, he would not by such discovery be enabled to dispense with a Creator, but would only have penetrated a little more deeply into His methods of procedure. The biological question is no doubt much more intricate and difficult than the chemical, but is of the same general character. On the principles of Biblical theism it may be stated in this way: God has created all living beings according to their kinds or species, but with capacities for variation and change under the laws which He has enacted for them. Can we ascertain any of the methods of such creation or making, and can we know how many of the forms which we have been in the habit of naming as distinct species coincide with His creative species, and how many are really results of their variations under the laws of reproduction and heredity, and the influence of their surroundings?

The biological question stated on the principles of Biblical Theism.

There can be no doubt that these questions lie at present on the very borders of legitimate science, and that many of the answers which are given to them are rather subjective than based on objective reality.

The evidence of geology in favour of alternate periods of introduction of new forms.

The evidence of geology is altogether in favour of alternate periods of introduction of new forms over great areas in vast numbers, and of periods characterised rather by extinction than renewal, and this in the case of both animals and plants[1] If this were once distinctly understood, there would be less divergence between theistic evolution and the Biblical record of creation than that which now appears. It cannot however be too strongly insisted on, that the divergent views of the several schools of evolutionists are not definite results of scientific investigation, but to a large extent mere speculations or inferences from facts as yet imperfectly known, which will depend for their acceptance or rejection on discoveries yet to be made.

The divergent views of the several schools of evolutionists as yet mere speculations or inferences.

THE ORIGIN AND EARLY HISTORY OF MAN.[2]

WITH reference to the origin and early history of man, the points of contact between the Bible and science have become many and complicated, in consequence of the very important discoveries of the remains of men who lived before the dawn of any secular history. The term "prehistoric" as applied to such men is, of course, altogether relative. In America all is prehistoric before the first voyage of Columbus. In England, all before

The term "prehistoric" relative.

---

[1] "The Chain of Life in Geological Time," "The Story of the Earth," Address by the author at Detroit Meeting of American Association.

[2] See for more full details on this subject, the Tract of this series on the *Age and Origin of Man*, by Pattison and Pfaff.

Julius Cæsar is prehistoric. In Egypt and the East we have written history that extends beyond the date of Abraham. In the Bible, history extends back to Paradise and to Adam. The prehistoric men of archæology and geology are, however, those known to us only by their remains found in caves and river gravels and similar depositories, and who, whatever their actual ages, have left no written records. The questions of how old they actually are, and how they can be connected with the Biblical history, are those that have established points of contact with revelation. Geology has divided the whole chronology of animal life on the earth into four great periods.[1] In the three first of these periods not only are remains of man absent, but we find no examples of those higher animals which are most nearly elated to him in structure. In the geological as n the Biblical record, the lords of creation in those arlier periods were the "swarmers," and the great eptiles. It is, therefore, to the last of these eriods, the Tertiary or Kainozoic, that we must ook for human remains.

The Bible history of man and the prehistoric men of archæology and geology.

Four periods of animal life according to geology.

Human remains to be looked for in the last.

This, the last of the four great "times" of the arth's geological history, was ingeniously subivided by Lyell, on the ground of percentages of arine shells and other invertebrates of the sea. ccording to this method, which, with some modi-

---

[1] Eozoic, Palæozoic, Mesozoic, and Kainozoic

Lyell's subdivision of the last of the four great "times" of the earth's geological history.

fications in details is still accepted, the *Eocene*, or dawn of the recent, includes those formations in which the percentage of modern species of marine animals does not exceed 3½, all the other species found being extinct. The *Miocene* (less recent) includes formations in which the percentage of living species does not exceed 35, and the *Pliocene* (more recent) contains formations having more than 35 per cent. of recent species. To these three may be added the *Pleistocene*, in which the great majority of the species are recent, and the *Modern*, in which all may be said to be living. With respect to the higher creatures, the ordinary quadrupeds, such percentages do not apply. These animals begin to appear in the Eocene, but no recent species occur until we reach the later Tertiary or Pliocene. The Eocene thus includes formations in which there are remains of mammals or ordinary land quadrupeds, but none of these belong to recent species or genera, though they may be included in the same families and orders with the recent mammals. This is a most important fact, as we shall see, and the only exception to it is that Gaudry and others hold that a few living genera, as those of the dog civet, and marten, are actually found in the late Eocene. The Miocene includes formations in whic there are living genera of mammals, but no specie which survive to the present time. The Plioce and Pleistocene show living species, though in th former these are very few and exceptional, while in the latter they become the majority.

The geological antiquity of man.

With regard to the geological antiquity of man, no geologist expects to find any human remains in beds older than the Tertiary, because in the older periods the conditions of the world do not seem to have been suitable to man, and because in these periods no animals nearly akin to man are known. On entering into the Eocene Tertiary we fail in like manner to find any human remains; and we do not expect to find any, because no living species and scarcely any living genera of mammals are known in the Eocene; nor do we find in it remains of any of the creatures, as the anthropoid apes for instance, most nearly allied to man. In the Miocene the case is somewhat different. Here we have living genera at least, and we have large species of apes; but no relics of man have been discovered, if we except some splinters of flint found in beds of this age at Thenay in France, and a notched rib-bone. Supposing these objects to have been chipped or notched by animals, which is rendered very unlikely by the results of the most recent investigations, the question remains, was this done by man? The probability on general grounds of the existence of men at this period is so small, that Gaudry and Dawkins, two of the best authorities,[1] prefer to suppose that the artificer

No human remains in the Eocene period.

---

[1] "Les Enchainements du Monde Animal;" "Early Man in Europe."

Miocene man improbable.

was one of the anthropoid apes of the period. It is true that no apes are known to do such work now; but then other animals, as beavers and birds, are artificers, and some extinct animals possessed higher powers than their modern representatives. But if there were Miocene apes which chipped flints and cut bones, this would, either on the hypothesis of evolution or that of creation by law, render the occurrence of man still less likely than if there were no such apes. For these reasons neither Dawkins nor Gaudry, nor indeed any geologists of authority in the Tertiary fauna, believe in Miocene man.

Human remains supposed to have been found in Pliocene beds have probably come there by some slip of the ground.

In the Pliocene, as Dawkins points out, though the facies of the mammalian fauna of Europe becomes more modern, and a few modern species occur, the climate becomes colder, and in consequence the apes disappear, so that the chances of finding fossil men are lessened rather than increased, in so far as the temperate regions are concerned. In Italy, however, Capellini, has described a skull, an implement, and a notched bone, supposed to have come from Pliocene beds, and which are preserved in the Museum of Florence. They are all, however, of so recent types that it is in every way likely they have become mixed with the Pliocene stuff by some slip of the ground. As the writer has elsewhere pointed out[1] similar and apparently fatal objections apply to the skull and implements alleged to have been found in Pliocene gravels in California. Dawkins further informs us that in the Italian Pliocene beds supposed to hold remains of man, of twenty-one mammalia whose bones occur, all are extinct species except possibly one, a hippopotamus. This of course renders very unlikely in a geological point of view the occurrence of human remains in these beds, and up to this time no such discovery has been certainly established.

---

[1] *Fossil Men*, 1880.

The Pleistocene deposits of Europe.

In the Pleistocene deposits of Europe—and this applies also to America—we for the first time find a predominance of recent species of land animals. Here, therefore, we may look with some hope for remains of man and his works, and here, accordingly, in the later Pleistocene or early Modern, they are actually found. When we speak, however, of Pleistocene man, there arise questions as to the classification of the deposits, which it seems to the writer that some of the leading geologists have not answered in accordance with geological facts, and a misunderstanding as to which may lead to serious error.

Geological formation of the Pleistocene period.

The geological formations of the Pleistocene period are, for the most part, superficial gravels and clays, and deposits in caverns, and it is somewhat difficult, in many cases, to ascertain their relative ages We are aided in this, however, by certain

The continental period of the Pleistocene.

The glacial period.

Second continental period.

ascertained facts as to elevations and submergences of the land, and as to climatal conditions in the northern hemisphere. There was at the beginning of the Pleistocene what has been called a continental period, when the land of the northern hemisphere was more extensive than now, and there seems to have been a mild climate. This was succeeded by a period of cold, the so-called glacial period, in which the land became diminished in extent by submergence, and the climate became so severe that snow and ice prevailed over nearly all the temperate regions of Europe, Asia, and North America. After this there was a second continental period of mild climate, succeeded by another submergence of limited duration, and then the continents acquired the forms which they still retain. These chronological points, important in reference to the correlation of geology and the Bible, are represented in the following table:—

Chronological table.

The Pleistocene and Modern in the Northern Hemisphere with reference to the Introduction of Man.

(*In descending order from newer to older.*)

Modern, or Period of Man and Modern Mammals:—

- *Recent Age.*—Continents at or nearly at their present levels.—Existing races of men and living species of mammals in Europe.
- *Post-glacial* or *Second Continental Age.*—Land more extensive than now. Climate temperate. Man represented in Europe and Western Asia by races now extinct, and contemporary with the mammoth and other great mammals also extinct,

but also with modern species. This was terminated by a submergence fatal to men and many mammalia, and covering the land with gravel and silt.

Pleistocene, or Period of extinct and a few recent Mammals:—

Later Pleistocene, or Glacial Age.—Cold climate and great submergence of land in northern hemisphere.

Early Pleistocene or *First Continental Age.*—Land very extensive, and inhabited by many mammals now extinct. Climate temperate.

Earliest indications of man.

It will be observed, with reference to the above table, that the earliest certain indications of man belong to the modern period alone, and that this modern or human period is divided into two portions by a great submergence, in which certain races of men and many mammals perished, and after which the geographical conditions of the northern hemisphere were considerably modified. I have not used the terms historic and pre-historic in the above table, because, while in most countries the period of written history covers only a locally variable part of the recent age, in other countries it extends back into the post-glacial, which thus becomes the antediluvian period. I have, however, elsewhere proposed the name Palæocosmic for the men of the post-glacial age, and Neocosmic for the men of the recent ages, and shall use these terms rather than Palæolithic and Neolithic, since these last refer to forms of implements which, though locally of great antiquity, exist in some places up to the present day. The men of the post-glacial age have also been called men of the gravels and caves, and the men of the mammoth and reindeer ages, and they resemble in physical features the modern Turanian races of Northern Europe, Asia, and America. We might, with reference to the Bible history, call them antediluvian men, but the evidence of this will appear in the sequel. In the meantime we may observe that the testimony of the earth coincides with that of the Bible, in representing man as the latest member of the animal kingdom, the last-born of animals.

The testimony of the earth and the testimony of the Bible coincide in representing man as the last-born of the animals.

The most important point with reference to any parallelism between the geological history of man as tabulated above, and the Biblical record, is to ascertain what absolute value in time can be assigned to the several ages known as post-glacial and recent, or, in other words, how long ago it is since the glacial period terminated. So vague are the data for any calculation of this kind, that the estimates of the date of the glacial period have ranged from hundreds of thousands of years down to a very few thousands. The tendency of recent investigations has been to discard the higher estimates and to bring the close of the glacial age constantly nearer to the present time. The absence of any change in invertebrate life, the small amount of erosion that has occurred since the glacial age, and many

The tendency of recent investigations to bring the close of the glacial age nearer to our own time.

other considerations, have been tending in this direction. I may refer to only one criterion, the importance and availability of which were long ago recognised by Sir Charles Lyell. This is the recession of the Falls of Niagara, from the shores of Lake Ontario to their present position. This recession is effected by the cutting back of beds of limestone and shale; and the resulting gorge, about seven miles in length, cuts through the deposits of the glacial period, proving, what on other grounds would be obvious, that the cutting began immediately after the glacial age. When Lyell estimated the time required, the rate of recession of the Fall was supposed to be one foot per annum. It is found, however, by the results of actual surveys[1] to be three feet annually. Lyell's estimate of the time required was thirty thousand years. The new measurements reduced this to one third, and further abatements are required by the possibly easier cutting of the first part of the gorge, by the fact that a portion of it of uncertain amount above the "whirlpool," had been cut at an earlier period and needed only to be cleared out, and by the probability that, in the early post-glacial period there was more water in the Niagara river than at present. We thus have physical proof that the close of the glacial submergence and re-elevation of the American land

The recession of the Falls of Niagara.

Lyell's estimate of the time required.

The new measurements.

The close of the glacial submergence and re-elevation of American land.

---

[1] Report of the Geodetic Surveys of the State of New York.

could not have occurred more than about eight thousand years ago. It follows that the ordinarily received chronology of about four or five thousand years for the post-diluvian period, and two thousand or a little more for the antediluvian period, will exhaust all the time that geology can allow for the possible existence of man, at least in the temperate regions of the northern hemisphere. Facts recently ascertained with reference to the delta of the Nile,[1] lead to similar conclusions for the oldest seats of human civilisation. Whatever demands may be made by philologists, historians, or antiquaries, or by the necessities of theories of evolution, must now be kept within the limits of facts such as those above referred to, and which are furnished to us by physical geography and geology. These facts must also lead to considerable revision of the excessive uniformitarianism of one school of English geologists, and to explanations more reasonable than some which have been current as to the deposition and age of superficial gravels and similar deposits. When all these points have been adjusted, it will be found that there is a sufficiently precise accordance between science and Bible history with regard to the antiquity and early history of man.

The ordinarily received chronology of the post-diluvian period all that geology can allow for the existence of man in the temperate regions of the northern hemisphere.

The accordance between science and Bible history with regard to the antiquity and early history of man.

---

[1] "Egypt and Syria," in *Bypaths of Bible Knowledge.*

THE EDENIC STATE OF MAN.

PERHAPS no portion of Bible history seems to have been more thoroughly set at naught by modern scientific speculations than the golden age of Eden, so dear to the imagination of the poet, so interwoven with the past condition and future prospects of man, as held by all religions. It can easily be shown, however, that there are important points of agreement between the simple story of Eden, as we have it in Genesis, and scientific probabilities as to the origin of man. Let us glance at these probabilities.

The Bible story of Eden and scientific probabilities as to the origin of man.

We have already seen that man is a recent animal in our world. Now, under any hypothesis as to his origin, the external conditions must have been suitable to him before he could appear. If, to use the terms of evolutionary philosophy, he was a product of the environment acting on the nature of a lower animal, this would be all the more necessary. Further, it would be altogether improbable that these favourable conditions should prevail at one time over the whole world. They must, in the nature of things, have prevailed only in some particular region, the special "centre of creation" of man; and this, whether its conditions arose by chance, as certain theorists would have

Favourable conditions for man's appearance necessary.

us believe, or were divinely ordained, must have been to the first men the Eden where they could subsist safely when few, and whence they could extend themselves as they increased in numbers. There is, therefore, in science nothing inconsistent with the Scripture statement that God "prepared a place for man."

Science not inconsistent with Scripture statement.

Further, no one supposes that man appeared at first with weapons, armour, and arts full-blown. He must have commenced his career naked, destitute of weapons and clothing, and with only such capacities for obtaining food as his hands and feet could give him. For such a being it was absolutely necessary that the region of his *début* should furnish him with suitable food, and should not task his resources as to shelter from cold or as to defence from wild animals. The statements in Genesis that it was a "garden," that is, a locality separated in some way from the uninhabited wilderness around; that it was stocked with trees pleasant to the sight and good for food; and that man was placed therein naked and destitute of all the arts of life, to subsist on the spontaneous fruits of the earth, are thus perfectly in accordance with the requirements of the case.

The account in Genesis in accordance with the requirements of the case.

If we inquire as to the portion of the world in which man at first appeared, the theory of evolution advises us to look to those regions of the world in which the lowest types of men now exist

The suggestions of the theory of evolution as the locality of man's appearance absurd.

or recently existed, as Tasmania, Tierra del Fuego, and the Cape of Good Hope, or it assures us that those tropical jungles which now afford congenial haunts for anthropoid apes, but are most unsuitable for the higher races of men, are the regions most likely to have witnessed the origin of man. But this is manifestly absurd, since, in the case of any species, we should expect that it would originate where the conditions are most favourable to the existence of that species, and not in those regions where, as shown by the result, it can scarcely exist when introduced. We should look for the centre whence men have spread, to those regions in which they can most easily live, and in which they have most multiplied and prospered. In historical times these indications, and also those of tradition, archæology, and affiliation of languages and races, point to Western Asia as the cradle of man. Even Haeckel in his *History of Creation*, though it is convenient, in connection with his theoretical views, to assume for the origin of man a continent of "Lemuria" now submerged under the Indian Ocean, traces all his lines of affiliation back to the vicinity of the Persian Gulf, in the neighbourhood of the districts to which the Bible history restricts the site of Eden. Wallace has shown that considerations of physical geography render it in the highest degree improbable that any such continent in the Indian Ocean ever existed, so that Haeckel's

All indications point to Western Asia as the cradle of man.

map of the affiliation of man actually accords with the statements of the Pentateuch, except in an extension of the lines of descent southward which science refuses to grant to him.

Changes connected with the fall of man.

Again, there is reason to believe that, at the fall of man, climatic, or other changes, expressed by the "cursing of the ground," occurred, and that in the Edenic system of things very large portions of the earth were to be or become suitable to the happy residence of man. Geology makes us familiar with the fact that such changes have occurred in the latter half of the Tertiary period, to such an extent that at one time the plants of warm temperate regions could flourish in Spitzbergen, and at another ice and snow covered the land far into temperate latitudes. Further, it would seem that the oldest men known to us by archæological discoveries, and who are probably equivalent to the later Antediluvians, lived at a time of somewhat rough and rigorous climate,—a time when the earth was cursed with cold and with physical vicissitudes, and which probably succeeded a more favourable period in which man appeared.

No necessity for giving up the story of Eden.

Thus it would seem that we are not under any scientific necessity to give up the old and beautiful story of Eden, and that on the contrary, this better accords with the probabilities as to the origin of man than do those hypotheses of his derivation which have been avowedly founded on scientific considerations

BODY, SOUL, AND SPIRIT.

Man a special creation.

New Testament terms relating to the constitution of man.

The formula "Body, soul, and spirit."

IN Genesis man has the dignity of being represented as a special creation, and this arises, not from anything in his merely bodily or physical constitution, but from that higher spiritual and rational nature said to have been conferred on him by the special inbreathing or inspiration of God. It is this which makes him the "shadow and likeness" of God, and fits him for being the lord of the earth. It would be easy to show that this spirit as distinguished from mere animal life or soul, the "inspiration of the Almighty" as Job calls it, is constantly referred to in the Hebrew Scriptures, but it has its most clear development in the New Testament. Every thoughtful reader of the Gospels and the Epistles in the original must have noticed the peculiar use of the words "flesh," "soul or life," and "spirit,"[1] and of the adjectives derived from them, and must have perceived that these terms are used in constant and definite senses, though there are of course some exceptional and figurative employments of them, and cases where one of the terms implies another not mentioned.[2] He may have regarded this classification as expressing definite ideas of the writers as to a three-fold constitution of human nature, as merely arbitrary and accidental, or as conforming to a classification current at the time. In either of these cases he may have felt some interest in comparing it with the arrangements of modern psychology. Yet in such comparison he will have found little satisfaction, unless he turns to that reaction of physiology upon mental science which is so influential in our day; but here, if I mistake not, he will find some curious points of contact between modern science and the Biblical view of humanity. In making this comparison, we must refer, for the Biblical distinction of body, soul, and spirit, and for the conditions under which an eternal life is affirmed to be possible for all three, to the New Testament itself, and to the numerous theological writers who have discussed the subject.

---

[1] Σάρξ, ψυχὴ, πνευμα.

[2] We have also, "Body (σῶμα), soul, and spirit," 1 Thess. v. 23.

Points of contact between modern science and the Biblical view of man.

The influence of physiological facts on our views.

Hitherto it has been somewhat difficult to bring this Biblical psychology, if it may be so called, into harmony with the mental science of the schools. But any one who has read Calderwood's recent work, *The Relations of Mind and Brain,*[1] must be aware that physiological facts relating to the organism, the "flesh" of the New Testament, are beginning very seriously to modify our views. We now know that the grey cellular matter of the brain constitutes a reservoir of sensory and motor energy, which supplies the power necessary to

The grey cellular matter of the brain a reservoir of sensory and motor energy.

---

[1] London, 1879.

place us in relation with things without, and to impress, by means of muscular effort, our own power on the outer world. Further, there seems the best reason to believe that the mass of the brain is directly connected with sensation and motion, though there seem to be means of regulation and co-operation of sensations and actions in connection with the front and back portions of the cerebral hemispheres. There are facts indicating that the anterior portions of the hemispheres are the organs of a certain determining and combining property of the nature of animal intelligence, and that the posterior portions, in association with the sympathetic nerve, are connected with the affections and passions.[1] Now all this belongs, in the first instance, to living nerve matter, and is possessed by man in common with animals. They, like us, can perform reflex or automatic actions, altogether or partially involuntary. They, like us, can perceive and reflect, and have affections, passions, and appetites. Even in animals this supposes something beyond the mere organism, and which can combine and compare sensations and actions. This is the animal or psychical life, which, whatever its essential nature, is something above and

The mass of the brain connected with sensation and motion.

All this belongs tc man in common with animals beyond mere nerve-power, though connected with it and acting by means of it. But in man there are other and higher powers, determining his conscious personality, his formation of general principles, his rational and moral volitions and self-restraints. These are manifestations of a higher spiritual nature, which constitutes in man the "image and shadow of God."

---

[1] It is a very old and in some respects well-founded notion that the viscera are connected with the affections. We now know something of the relation of these to the sympathetic nerve system, and to the posterior portion of the cerebral lobes. Ferrier, Calderwood, and very recently Bucke, have discussed these points.

Man has other and higher powers.

Thus the physiologist may fairly claim, not for protoplasm as such, but for the living organism, all the merely reflex actions, as well as the appetites and desires, and much that belongs to perception and ordinary intelligence. These may be regarded as bodily and psychical in the narrow sense. But the higher regulating powers belong to a spiritual domain into which he cannot enter.

It is interesting to observe here that even those who seem most desirous to limit the powers of man to mere properties of the living organism are prevented by their own consciousness, as well as by scientific facts, from fully committing themselves to this. Tyndall admits the existence of a "chasm" "intellectually impassable" between physical facts and human consciousness. Huxley's human automaton is a "conscious automaton," and in some sense "endowed with free will," and he declines to admit that he will ever be proved to be only "the cunningest of nature's clocks." Spencer and writers of his school have made similar ad-

Tyndall's admission.

Huxley.

Spencer.

missions. There are, it is true, extreme writers like Buchner, with whom matter is the origin and essence of all that exists, but their strong assertions of this, being destitute of proof, can scarcely be held to be scientific.

Extreme position of Buchner.

At present no doubt this whole subject is as a department of science somewhat crude and rudimentary, and it becomes us to speak with some reserve respecting it, but the drift of opinion is in the direction above indicated. It has become evident that the more recent discoveries as to the functions of brain will not warrant the extreme views of materialists, while on the other hand they serve to correct the doctrines of those who have run into the opposite extreme of attaching no importance to the fleshly organism and its endowment of animal life. In like manner, these discoveries are tending to establish definite boundaries between the domain of mere automatism and that of rational will. In so far as these results are attained, we are drawn more closely to that middle ground occupied by the New Testament writers, and which, without requiring us to commit ourselves to any new hypotheses or technical distinctions, gives a fair valuation to all the parts of the composite nature of man. The practical value of this Bible philosophy is well known. It relegates to their proper place the merely somatic and psychical elements of our nature, admits their

Recent discoveries as to the functions of the brain will not warrant the extreme views of materialists.

They tend to define the boundaries between mere automatism and rational will.

The practical value of the Bible philosophy.

value in that place, and condemns them only when they usurp the position of the higher determining powers. It seeks to place these last in their true relation to our fellow-men and to God, and to provide for their regulation under God's law and the guidance of His Spirit, with the object of securing a true and perfect equilibrium of all the parts of our nature. It is thus enabled to hold forth a prospect of eternal life, peace, and happiness to body, soul, and spirit, and to point out the meaning and the value of the conflicts which rage within the man in our present imperfect state. This practical object, in connection with the mission of the Saviour, is what the New Testament has in view; but in arriving at this, it has undoubtedly pointed to the solutions of the mysteries of our nature at which science and philosophy are beginning to arrive by their own paths; just as, in another department, the Bible has shadowed forth the great principles and process of creation in advance of the discoveries of geology.

What Bible philosophy aims at.

The prospect it holds forth.

THE FALL OF MAN.

THE fall of man presents itself as a serious question in the study of nature, as well as in theology. When we consider man as an improver and innovator in the world, there is much that suggests a contrariety between him and nature, and that instead of being the pupil of his environment he becomes its tyrant. In this aspect man, and especially civilized man, appears as the enemy of wild nature, so that in those districts which he has most fully subdued, many animals and plants have been exterminated, and nearly the whole surface has come under his processes of culture, and has lost the characteristics which belonged to it in its primitive state. Nay more, we find that by certain kinds of so-called culture, man tends to exhaust and impoverish the soil, so that it ceases to minister to his comfortable support, and becomes a desert. Vast regions of the earth are in this impoverished condition, and the westward march of exhaustion warns us that the time may come when, even in comparatively new countries like America, the land will cease to be able to sustain its inhabitants. We know also from geology that the present state of the physical world is not the best possible for man; and that its climatic conditions, in the middle Tertiary for example, have been much better than at present.

Contrariety between man and nature.

What geology teaches of the present state of the physical world.

Here there rises before us a spectre which science and philosophy often appear afraid to face, and which asks the dread question, What is the cause of the apparently abnormal character of the relations of man and nature? In attempting to solve this question, we must admit that the position of

The cause of the abnormal relations of man and nature.

man even here is not without natural analogies. The stronger preys upon the weaker, the lower form gives place to the higher, and in the progress of geological time old species have died out in favour of newer, and old forms of life have been exterminated by later successors. Man, as the newest and highest of all, has thus the natural right to subdue and rule the world. Yet there can be little doubt that he uses this right unwisely and cruelly, and these terms themselves explain why he does so, because they imply freedom of will. Given a system of nature destitute of any being higher than the instinctive animal, and introduce into it a free rational agent, and you have at once an element of instability. So long as his free thought and purpose continue in accord with the arrangements of his environment, so long all will be harmonious; but the very hypothesis of freedom implies that he can act otherwise, and so perfect is the equilibrium of existing things, that one wrong or unwise action may unsettle the nice balance, and set in operation trains of causes and effects producing continued and ever-increasing disturbance. This "fall of man" we know as a matter of observation and experience has actually occurred, and its only natural remedy would be to cast man back again into the circle of merely instinctive action, or to carry him forward, until by growth in wisdom and knowledge he should again

Freedom of will an element of instability.

Man has actually fallen.

be fitted to be the lord of creation. The first method has been proved unsuccessful by the rebound of humanity against all the attempts to curb and suppress its liberty. The second has been the effort of all reformers and philanthropists since the world began; but its imperfect success affords a strong ground for clinging to the Theistic view of nature, for soliciting the intervention of a Power higher than man, and for hoping for a final restitution of all things through the intervention of that Power. Mere materialistic evolution must ever and necessarily fail to account not only for the higher nature of man, as well as his disharmony with other parts of nature, and for his moral aberrations. These only come rationally into the system of nature under the supposition of a higher Intelligence, from whom man emanates, and whose nature he shares.

The intervention of a higher power to remedy the fall needed.

What the theistic view introduces us to.

But on this Theistic view we are introduced to a kind of unity and of evolution for a future age, which is the great topic of revelation, and is not unknown to science and philosophy, in connection with the law of progress and development deducible from the geological history, in which an ascending series of lower animals culminates in man himself. Why should there not be a new and higher plane of existence to be attained to by humanity—a new geological period, so to speak, in which present anomalies shall be corrected, and the grand unity

St. Paul's anticipation.

Angels conceivable.

Their constitution and powers.

Part of nature.

They bridge over the gulf between humanity and Deity.

Christianity the highest bond of the unity of nature.

of the universe and its harmony with its Maker fully restored? This is what Paul anticipates when he tells of a "pneumatical" or spiritual body to succeed to the present natural or "psychical" one, or what Jesus Himself tells us when He says that in the future state we shall be like to the angels. Angels are not known to us as objects of scientific observation, but such an order of beings is quite conceivable, and this not as supernatural, but as part of the order of nature. They are created beings like ourselves, subject to the laws of the universe, yet free and intelligent and liable to error, in bodily constitution freed from many of the limitations imposed on us, mentally having higher range and grasp, and consequently masters of natural powers not under our control. In short, we have here pictured to us an order of beings forming a part of nature, yet in their powers as miraculous to us as we might be supposed to be to lower animals, could they think of such things. This idea of angels bridges over the otherwise impassable gulf between humanity and deity, and illustrates a higher plane than that of man in his present state, but attainable in the future. Dim perceptions of this would seem to constitute the substratum of the ideas of the so-called polytheistic religions. Christianity itself is in this aspect not so much a revelation of the supernatural as the highest bond of the great unity of nature. It reveals to us the perfect Man, who is also one with God, and the mission of this divine man to restore the harmonies of God and humanity, and consequently also of man with his natural environment in this world, and with his spiritual environment in the higher world of the future. If it is true that nature now groans because of man's depravity, and that man himself shares in the evils of this disharmony with nature around him, it is clear that if man could be restored to his true place in nature he would be restored to happiness and to harmony with God; and if, on the other hand, he can be restored to harmony with God, he will then be restored also to harmony with his natural environment, and so to life, and happiness, and immortality. It is here that the old story of Eden, and the teaching of Christ, and the prophecy of the New Jerusalem strike the same note which all material nature gives forth, when we interrogate it respecting its relations to man. The profound manner in which these truths appear in the teaching of Christ has perhaps not been appreciated as it should, because we have not sought in that teaching the philosophy of nature which it contains. When He points to the common weeds of the fields, and asks us to consider the garments more gorgeous than those of kings in which God has clothed them, and when He says of these same wild flowers, so daintily made by the supreme Artificer, that to-day

What it reveals to us.

The restoration of man and its effects.

The philosophy of nature in Christ's teaching not sufficiently appreciated.

they are, and to-morrow are cast into the oven, He gives us not merely a lesson of faith, but a deep insight into that want of unison which, centering in humanity, reaches all the way from the wild flower to the God who made it, and requires for its rectification nothing less than the breathing of that Divine Spirit which first evoked order and life out of primæval chaos. When He points out to us the growth of these flowers without any labour of their own, He in like manner opens up one of the most profound analogies between the growth of the humblest living thing and that of the new spiritual nature which may be planted in man by that same Divine Spirit.

ANTEDILUVIANS.

The Noachian deluge a fact of ancient Assyrian history.

THE deluge of Noah has ceased to be a matter solely theological or dependent on the veracity of Genesis. It has now become a fact of ancient Assyrian history, a tradition preserved by many and various races, a pluvial or diluvial age, or time of subsidence, intervening between the oldest race of men known to geology and modern times. We are at least entitled, conjecturally, to identify these things, and through means of these identifications to arrive at some definite conceptions of the condition and character of the earliest men, whether we call them the Antediluvians of the Bible, or the Palæocosmic or Palæolithic men of geology.

The Book of Genesis traces man back to Eden, the characteristics of which we have already considered, and which is placed by that old record, as by the Assyrian genesis, in the Euphratean valley, whether in its upper table-lands or in its delta. From this Eden man was expelled, the old Aryan traditions say by physical deterioration—the incoming, perhaps, of a later glacial age. The Semitic traditions, on the other hand, refer it to a moral fall and a judicial visitation of God. In any case it was a very real evil, involving a change from that condition of happy abundance and freedom from physical toil, which all histories and hypotheses as to human origin must assign to the earliest state of our species, to a condition of privation, exposure, labour, struggle for existence against the uncongenial environment of a wilderness world. Such new conditions of existence must have tended to try the capabilities and endowments of men. Under certain circumstances, and when not too severe, they must have developed energy, inventiveness, and sagacity, and thus may have produced a physical and mental improvement. Under other circumstances they must have had a deteriorating influence, degrading the physical powers and reducing the mental nature almost to a bestial condition. The experience of our modern world, and even of civilized communities, enables us too well to comprehend these opposite effects.

Expulsion from Eden

Aryan traditions.

Semitic traditions.

Effects of the new conditions of existence.

In any case, such struggle was, on the whole, better for man when in an imperfect state. Only a creature perfectly simple and harmless morally, could enjoy with advantage the privileges of an Eden.

Division of the human family into two tribes.

The Bible story, however, gives us a glimpse of still another and unexpected vicissitude. The human family at a very early period split into two tribes. One of these, the Sethidæ, simple, God-fearing, conservative, shepherds and soil-tillers; the other, the Cainidæ, active, energetic, godless, city-builders and inventors. Among the Cainidæ sprang up another division into citizen peoples, dwelling in dense communities, practising metallurgy and other arts, inventing musical instruments, and otherwise advancing in material civilisation; and wandering Jabalites—nomads with movable tents, migrating widely over the earth, and perhaps locally descending to the rudest forms of the hunter's life. Thus from the centre of Eden and the fall sprang three diverse lines of human development.

Division of the Cainidæ.

Intermarriages

But a time came when these lines reacted on each other. The artisans and inventors intermarried with the simple country folk. The nomadic tribes threw themselves in invading swarms on the settled communities. Mixed races arose, and wars, conquests, and disturbances, tending to limit more and more the areas of peace and of plenty, and to make more and more difficult the lives of those who sought to adhere to the old Edenic simplicity; until this was well-nigh rooted out, and the earth was filled with violence. In the midst of this grew up a mixed race of men, strong physically, with fierce passions, daring, adventurous, and cruel, who lorded it over the earth, and deprived others of their natural rights and liberties—the giants and men of renown of antediluvian times, the "Nephilim" of the Bible, the demigods and heroes of many ancient idolatries.

The rise of a mixed race of men

Their characteristics and exploits.

Such, according to the Bible, was the condition of the later antediluvians, and in this was the reason why they were swept away with a flood. Before this catastrophe, we can gather from the story, there must have been great progress in the arts. Intellects of gigantic power, acting through the course of exceedingly long lives, had gained great mastery over nature, and had turned this to practical uses. There must have been antediluvian metallurgists as skilled as any of those in early post-diluvian times; engineers and architects capable of building cities, pyramids, and palaces, and artisans who could have built triremes equal to those of the Carthaginians. At the same time there must have been wild outlying tribes, fierce and barbarous. Farther, the state of society must have been such that there was great pressure for the

Progress.

State of society.

means of subsistence in the more densely peopled districts; and as agricultural labour was probably principally manual, and little aided by machines or animals, and as the primitive fertility of the soil must, over large regions, have been much exhausted, we can understand that lament of Lamech as to the hardness of subsistence with which he precedes his hopeful prophecy of better times in the days of Noah.[1] Certain geological facts also give us reason to suspect that in the later part of the antediluvian period, the climate of the northern hemisphere was undergoing a gradual refrigeration.[2]

Change of climate in later antediluvian days.

The godless and materialistic character of the time.

Another feature of the antediluvian time was its godless and materialistic character. This is quaintly represented in some of the American legends of the deluge, by the idea that the antediluvian men were incapable of thanking the gods for the benefits they received. They had, in short, lost the beliefs in a ruling divinity and a promised Saviour, and had thrown themselves wholly into a materialistic struggle for existence, and this was the reason why they were morally and spiritually hopeless and had to be destroyed. We do not hear of any idolatry or superstition in antediluvian times, nor of the lower vices of the more corrupt

---

[1] Gen. v. 29.

[2] This was certainly the case if the later Antediluvian age is the same with that of men of the "Rein-deer age" in Europe.

The vices of the antediluvians.

and degraded races. The vices of the antediluvians were those of a superior race, self-reliant, ambitious, and selfish. Devoting themselves wholly to secular aims and to the promotion of the arts of life, and utilizing to the utmost the bounties of nature, their motto was "let us eat and drink," not for to-morrow we die, but because we shall live long in our enjoyments. The inevitable result in the tyranny of the strong over the weak, and the rebellion of the weak against the strong, in the accumulation of wealth and luxury in favoured spots, and in the desolation of those spots by the violence and rapacity of rude and warlike tribes, came upon them to the full, but brought no repentance. Such a race, to whom God and the spiritual world had become unthinkable, to whom nothing but the material goods of life had any reality, who probably scoffed at the simple beliefs of their ancestors as the dreams of a rude age, had become morally irredeemable, and there was nothing in store for it but a physical destruction.

The race had become morally irredeemable.

The cataclysm by which these men were swept away may have been one of those submersions of our continents which, locally or generally, have occurred over and over again, almost countless times, in the geological history of the earth, and which, though often slow and gradual, must in other cases have been rapid, perhaps much more so than the hundred and twenty years which the Bible record allows us to assign to the whole period of the Noachic catastrophe.[1]

The ancient cave-men seem to resemble the ruder antediluvians.

It is an interesting fact that those ancient cave-men, whose bones testify to the existence of man in Europe before the last physical changes of the post-glacial age, and while many mammals now locally or wholly extinct still lived in Europe, present characters such as we might expect to find at least in the ruder nomadic tribes of the antediluvian men. Their large brains, great stature, and strong bones point to just such characters as would befit the giants that were in those days. It is farther of interest that though no relics of civilized antediluvians have yet been discovered, the early appearance of skill in the arts of life in the valleys of the Euphrates and Nile in post-diluvian times, points to an inheritance of antediluvian arts by the early Hamitic or Turanian nations, and is scarcely explicable on any other hypothesis.

Indications of an inheritance of antediluvian arts in Hamitic and Turanian nations.

The question of a possible relapse of the world into the antediluvian condition.

It is a question, raised by certain expressions of Scripture, whether the world will again fall into the condition in which it was before the flood. "As it was in the days of Noah," we are told, so shall it be when the Son of Man comes to judgment. To bring the world into such a state it would require that it should shake off all the superstitions, fears, and religious hopes which now affect it; that it should practically cast aside all belief in God, in morality, and in the spiritual nature and higher destiny of man; that it should devote itself wholly to the things that belong to the present life, and in the pursuit of these should be influenced by nothing higher than a selfish expediency. Then would the earth again be filled with violence, and again would it cry unto God for punishment, and again would He say, that "His Spirit should no longer strive with men," and that it "repented Him that He had made man upon the earth."

---

[1] Gen vi. 3, and 1 Pet. iii. 20.

The deluge comprehensible as a geological phenomenon.

I have said that such a catastrophe as the deluge of Noah, is in no respect incomprehensible as a geological phenomenon, and were we bound to explain it by natural causes, these would not be hard to find. The terms of the narrative in Genesis well accord with a movement of the earth's crust, bringing the waters of the ocean over the land, and at the same time producing great atmospheric disturbances. Such movements seem to have occurred at the close of the post-glacial or Palæocosmic age, and were probably connected with the extinction of the Palæocosmic, or cave-men of Europe, and of the larger land animals, their contemporaries; and these movements closed the later continental period of Lyell, and left the European land permanently at a lower level than formerly. Movements of this kind have been supposed by geologists to be very slow and gradual; but there is no certain evidence of this, since such movements of the land as have occurred in historical times, have sometimes been rapid; and there are many geological reasons tending to prove that this was the case with that which closed the post-glacial age.

The narrative in Genesis does not imply a sudden catastrophe.

It is to be observed, also, that the narrative in Genesis does not appear to imply a very sudden catastrophe. There is nothing to prevent us from supposing that the submergence of the land was proceeding during all the period of Noah's preaching, which we are told was 120 years, and the actual time during which the deluge affected the district occupied by the narrator was more than a year.

It purports to be the narrative of an eye-witness.

It is also to be observed, that the narrative in Genesis purports to be that of an eye-witness. He notes the going into the ark, the closing of its door, the first floating of the large ship; then its drifting, then the disappearance of visible land, and the minimum depth of fifteen cubits, probably representing the draft of water of the ark. Then we have the abating of the waters, with an intermittent action, going and returning, the grounding of the ark, the gradual appearance of the surrounding hills, the disappearance of the water, and finally the drying of the ground. All this, if historical in any degree, must consist of the notes of an eyewitness; and if understood in this sense, the narrative can raise no question as to the absolute universality of the catastrophe, since the whole

This view obviates the question of the universality of the catastrophe.

earth of the narrator was simply his visible horizon. This will also remove much of the discussion as to the animals taken into the ark, since these must have been limited to the fauna of the district of the narrator, and even within this the lists actually given in Genesis exclude the larger carnivorous animals. Thus, there would be nothing to prevent our supposing, on the one hand, that some species of animals became altogether extinct, and that the whole faunæ of vast regions not reached by the deluge remained intact. It is further curious that the narrative of the deluge preserved in the Assyrian tablets, like that of Genesis, purports to be the testimony of a witness, and indeed of the Assyrian equivalent of Noah himself. The "waters of Noah" are thus coming more and more within the cognizance of geology and archæology, and it is more than probable that other points of contact than those we have noticed may ere long develop themselves.

The narrative on the Assyrian tablets also purports to be the testimony of an eye-witness.

In connection with all this, a most important consideration is that above referred to, in the possible equivalency with the historical deluge of the great subsidence which closed the residence of palæocosmic men in Europe, as well as that of several of the large mammalia. Lenormant and others have shown that the wide and ancient acceptance of the tradition of the deluge among all the great branches of the human family necessi-

Lenormant's conclusion from the tradition of the deluge among all the great branches of the human family.

tates the belief that, independently of the Biblical history, this great event must be accepted as an historical fact which very deeply impressed itself upon the minds of all the early nations. Now, if the deluge is to be accepted as historical, and if a similar break interrupts the geological history of man, separating extinct races from those which still survive, why may we not correlate the two? The misuse of the deluge in the early history of geology, in employing it to account for changes that took place long before the advent of man, certainly should not cause us to neglect its legitimate uses, when these arise in the progress of investigation. It is evident that if this correlation be accepted as probable, it must modify many views now held as to the antiquity of man. In that case, the modern gravels spread over plateaus and in river valleys, far above the reach of the present floods, may be accounted for, not by the ordinary action of the existing streams, but by the abnormal action of currents of water diluvial in their character. Further, since the historical deluge cannot have been of very long duration, the physical changes separating the deposits containing the remains of palæocosmic men from those of later date would in like manner be accounted for, not by slow processes of subsidence, elevation, and erosion, but by causes of more abrupt and cataclysmic character.

The effect of correlation of the deluge and the break in the geological history of man on views held as to the antiquity of man.

PRIMITIVE SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS.

Attempts to trace the history of primitive man.

CERTAIN archæologists have recently been much occupied with attempts to trace the social condition of primitive man in the customs of the ruder and more barbaric tribes, and in turn to deduce these from a supposed bestial condition in which the family and the marriage tie did not exist. Now, it is well known, that in countries so widely separated as North America, India, Australia, and New Guinea, we find certain peculiar and often complex laws of affinity and of marriage, which are probably of very ancient origin. These are such as the following:—The recognition of woman as the principal factor in the family; descent in the female line, and systems of consanguinity based on this; exogamy or prohibition to marry within the same tribe or family; family totems or emblems devised to regulate these arrangements, and in connection with all this, a system of tribal communism in which the wives and mothers are a related community, into which the husbands are introduced from without by the practice of exogamy.

Ancient laws of affinity and marriage.

The relation of husband and wife must have existed from the beginning.

That this complicated system sprang from a primitive promiscuous intercourse is a pure assumption, and contrary to scientific probability. The long period of helplessness and dependence of the human child renders it essential that the relation of husband and wife should have existed from the first, or to place the matter on the lowest level, that man should be a permanently pairing animal, and the analogy of some of the animals nearest to man, though the nearest of these are very remote from him in this respect, strengthens this conclusion. Again, so soon as men formed tribes and communities, which necessity would oblige them to do almost from the first, it would become necessary to guard the family relation, and this was done by enforcing the rights of the wife and mother to her husband and her child, and to care and protection in child-bearing and nursing. Lastly, the law of exogamy could scarcely have been spontaneous, but must have been an expedient devised by sagacious leaders in order to prevent, on the one hand, too close inter-marriage, and, on the other, entire isolation on the part of the tribes into which men were necessarily divided, and at the same time to avert undue variation and degradation. In the record of the social arrangements of primitive man as given in the Bible, we have intimations of these institutions, and confirmations of their existence in subsequent references, even after the patriarchal and tribal arrangements had been fully established.

The need of guarding the family relation.

The design of the law of exogamy

Man the representative of God in the lower world.

Man was made in the "shadow and likeness of God," his representative in this lower world; but what of woman? "Male and female created He them;" and man in this double capacity was to

Woman shares the divine likeness.

The primitive law of marriage.

The effect of the fall

replenish the earth and subdue it, not its slave and worshipper, but its master—"treading it under his foot" as the words literally are. Man and woman were to do this, so that the woman as well as the man shares in the divine likeness; and it is in the family relation and in this alone, that such manifestation of God and the consequent subduing of the world can take place. Let us notice also that remarkable lesson taught to the man, when after submitting to him those animals nearest in rank, no help meet for him is found, and the woman is brought to him as his true help-meet, "bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh." This leads to the primitive law of marriage, which has until recently received less attention from historians and theologians than it merits; and not long ago, a late eminent archæologist was surprised when I pointed out to him that his discoveries of exogamy and descent in the female line had been anticipated in the law—"therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife." Here it is the husband who leaves his family to go with his wife, and she, as the centre of the family and mother of the children, is the true husband, the bond of the household. It is true, that after the fall and as a punitive visitation on the woman, it is decreed that her husband shall "rule over her;" but this, like other disabilities arising from the fall, may have been regarded in early times as an evil to be removed if possible.

Traces of the primitive practice in the patriarchal institutions.

Even under the patriarchal system, subsequently dominant, we find indications of the primitive practice in the belief of Sarah and Rebecca, that their sons, if they married in Canaan, must go into the tribe of their wives; and the prevalence of this law among many ancient nations, and especially among those of Turanian origin, has been well ascertained. Among American Indians, and Australian aborigines, it still lingers in customs which, however degraded, are nevertheless from the point of view of Genesis, reminiscences of unfallen men.

The patriarchal system and matriarchy.

I may pause here to note that the supposed antagonism between the patriarchal system, and what has been called "matriarchy" has no real existence, and this also is evident from the Scripture history. The social and family relations were founded on the rights of the woman; but the leader and counsellor of the tribe, the chief, especially in times of danger, is the oldest or most influential man. This distinction between civil and social laws has existed from the earliest times, and among very rude peoples, and it is singular that it should be overlooked as it has been in some recent discussions. Besides, as Dr. Tyler has remarked, when a maternal community has been broken up, and when one of its families has been for any reason separated from the others, it is natural that authority should fall into the hands of the father. In other words, primitively the father takes the lead in a journey or expedition; in the village community the women rule; in the tribe or clan there is a patriarchal chief.

The reference of Christ to the law of divorce.

The best scientific as well as Biblical illustration of the primitive nature of marriage is afforded by the reference to it made by Jesus Christ himself in connection with the law of divorce. The Pharisees, most self-satisfied men, wise in their own wisdom and case-hardened in their own orthodoxy, as the most earnest bigots of our own day, and the Sadducees, as shallow, sceptical, and contemptuous as the most advanced of our modern Agnostics, agreed in sanctioning the loose notions of their time as to the sacredness of marriage. It is the Pharisees, however, who put the question, "May a man put away his wife for every cause?"[1] saying in effect, "Is woman the slave of man? May she be put away for any caprice, treated with any injustice, without offence to God?" Our Lord scornfully takes them back to the Book of Genesis and its simple child-like story. "Have ye not read," He asks, "that He who made them male and female" enacted for them the law of marriage, and that this law was "the man shall cleave unto his wife, and the twain shall become one flesh." That is God's order. Is there any place in it for putting away? Nay, if there were such, would it not rather be the woman that could put away her husband, than the husband his wife?

---

[1] Matthew xix. 4.

The apostles' doctrine.

But, objected the Pharisees, Moses authorised divorce, and the Christian may also object and may plead the apostolic doctrine as to the subjection of woman,[1] but Christ has His answer to both. It is "because of the hardness of your hearts, but from the beginning it was not so." The original equality of man and woman was, like so much other good, broken down by the fall, which brought among other woes the subjection of woman, too often developed into tyranny and injustice to her.

Woman in a fallen world.

In a hard fallen world of labour, struggle, warfare, and danger, woman necessarily becomes the weaker vessel, and her original dignity of child-bearer, which gave her in Eden her high position, and which even after the fall is sought to be retained in her prophetic position as the potential mother of a Saviour, becomes in savage and rude states of society an additional cause of weakness and disability.

The restoration of woman,

Hence one of the great missions of Christianity is to restore woman to that place which she had in the beginning, to the Edenic position of being the equal help-meet of man. The Christian system, adapting this to the condition of an imperfect but improving world, holds before us the

---

[1] Eph. v. 22; 1 Peter iii. 1, and other passages in the New Testament, where however the fall of man is referred to as the reason of this subjection.

Christian daughter, sister, wife and mother, as the most beautiful of moral pictures, the pillars of God's family. But this ideal will not be realised till He whose first title is that of "Seed of the woman" shall have bruised the serpent's head, and shall have restored the paradise of God.

The realisation of the ideal.

The doctrine of the Bible and current speculation on the subject.

Before leaving this part of the subject it is well to contrast the grand and ennobling doctrine of the Bible, extending with perfect consistency all the way from the first notice of the relations of the sexes in Genesis to the personal teaching of Jesus, not only with the corruptions of His day, but with those base and degrading speculations of our time which can find in their godless philosophy no better foundation for the family and the rights of woman than the contests of beasts for the possession of their females. Perhaps none of the paths of Agnostic speculation is more repulsive than this to all the higher instincts of humanity, and certainly none is more instructive with reference to the abyss into which we are invited to fling ourselves. Let it be observed also that if we depart at all from the old Biblical idea of man created in the shadow and likeness of God, and thus endowed with a spiritual as well as an animal nature, there is no logical stopping-place, short of a moral gulf lower than that which any savage tribe has yet reached. In this respect our inquiries into the state of barbarous people striving to sustain themselves above mere anarchy and bestial relations by clinging to their old traditional laws and social customs, and in their darkness feeling after God if haply they may find Him, show us that their spiritual condition, low though it is, may be more hopeful than that to which the philosophical Agnostic has already reduced himself.

THE ORIGIN OF RELIGION.

The Duke of Argyll's view.

THE Duke of Argyll, in his work on the Unity of Nature, has well remarked that questions as to the origin of religion have some resemblance to the question, What is the origin of hunger and thirst? Given an organism wanting nourishment, and hunger and thirst seem to follow as matters of course. So in the case of religion: given a spiritual nature craving communion with its God, believing in its own indestructibility, having ideas of right and wrong, of duty and responsibility, some form of religion becomes a necessary condition of existence. The peculiarity of much modern writing as to the origin of religion is that the writers leave out of sight the spiritual nature of the man and the existence of a God revealing Himself to His rational offspring, and then proceed to ask how can a man destitute of any higher nature than that of the animal, and without any

Given a spiritual nature religion becomes a necessity of existence.

Much modern discussion assumes that man is destitute of a higher nature.

God, or incapable of knowing anything of Him, come to be a religious being? It is as if one were to imagine an animal destitute of any power of digestion, and of any need of food, and then to ask, How can it come to experience hunger and thirst? Conducted in this way, the inquiry as to the origin of religion must necessarily be nugatory.

On the other hand, if we are content to accept the nature of man as we find it in experience, and as it is represented to us in the Scriptures, we have a solution at once of the phenomenon that man is and always has been influenced by religion, just as he has been affected with hunger and thirst.

Misleading classification of religions.

The attempts that have been made to classify religions, have also much in them that is misleading. If, for example, we attempt to distinguish between natural and revealed religion, we shall find that no religion is wholly natural or wholly revealed. In all there lie at the bottom those instincts of natural conscience and belief in immortality which seem to be inborn in man. In all there is some room left for the reason as the judge of truth and right. On the other hand, if we believe the Hebrew Scriptures to embody a revelation from God, we must also believe that portions of the same revelation exist in all religions, however corrupt. The religion of Adam and of Noah, as stated in the Old Testament, was not that of the Hebrews merely, but of right, that of all

The religion of Adam and Noah, etc.

mankind. Up to the time, in short, of the special legislation of Moses, the religion of the Hebrews was not theirs alone, but the common property of mankind; and we must expect to find traces at least of such truths as the unity of God, the creation, the immortality of man, the fall, the promise of a Saviour, the deluge and its moral lessons, in all religions. Practically we do find this to be the case, and nothing can be more interesting than to trace in the varied idolatrous and corrupt religions the golden thread of Divine truth which penetrates them, however hidden and obscured by foreign accretions. Viewed in this way, the whole mythology of the world becomes intelligible, and is illuminated by the Bible light. Without this guidance, it ceases to afford any definite results even to scientific investigation.

A thread of divine truth penetrates the various idolatrous and corrupt religions.

Max Müller's classification.

Max Müller, in his *Science of Religion,* rejecting the division into natural and revealed, proposes to arrange religions according to the great divisions of the human race, as Turanian, Aryan and Semitic. This classification is, however, equally useless without the light cast on the subject by the Bible. If we call, for example, the Jewish religion Semitic, nothing can be more certain than that it was a quite exceptional Semitic religion during the greater part of its existence, differing from the religions of cognate races in Western Asia, as much as from the religions of other Gentile peoples. On

The Jewish an exceptional Semitic religion.

the other hand, if Turanians and Aryans as well as Semites were sons of Noah, they must at first have possessed the same religion, and must merely have developed this in different directions, which we can easily see was the fact, when we study the resemblances and differences of the religions of antiquity. If we ask what caused the religion of the Hebrews to differ, its own history informs us that this sprang first from the pronounced dissent of Abraham from the religion of other Semites, and his falling back on the simplicity of primitive Monotheism; secondly, and as a consequence of the former, from the purity and definiteness given by the legislation of Moses. That these men actually lived and influenced the religion of their own and later times we cannot doubt, because such doubt would throw all subsequent history into confusion. If they were acting under the influence of the Spirit of God,—as we believe them to have been,—then their religion is a product of inspiration, and therefore a revelation. If not then they stand merely on the level of successful reformers, though here again may arise the question whether any successful reformer or elevator of humanity is destitute of some special divine impulse. In any case it is clear that the theory of religion, if we may so express it, embodied in the Bible is consistent with itself, and with the history and present condition of religious

The cause of the difference of the Hebrew religion from other Semite religions.

The Bible theory of religion consistent with itself and with the history and present condition of religion.

beliefs, and that without taking this Biblical theory into consideration, it will be hopeless to attempt to explain the origin and history of religion, or to classify religions with any certainty.

NATURAL THEOLOGY.

J. S. Mill's admission.

THERE are certain schools of modern science and philosophy which affect contempt for the doctrine of final causes and for the teaching of the Bible with reference to the manifestation of God in His works. On the other hand, we find Mill, in one of his last essays, after rejecting every other argument for the existence of a God, admitting that the argument from design in the universe is irresistible, and that nature does testify of its Maker. There can be no question that in this Mill is right, if for no other reason than that old and well-known one that mere blind chance cannot be conceived of as capable of producing an orderly system of things. Farther, there can be no question that the one argument for a God which is convincing to Mill is also the one, and the only one, which the Holy Scriptures condescend to refer to. They habitually take the existence of God for granted, as something not needing to be proven to reasonable minds, but they reason from nature, with reference to His attributes and modes of procedure, as, for instance, in that remarkable passage of the Apostle Paul where he affirms that to the heathen the "power and divinity" of God are apparent from the things which He has made. But perhaps there is no part of the Bible in which the teaching of nature with reference to divine things is more fully presented than in the Book of Job, and not a few even of religious men fail to see the precise significance of the address of the Almighty to Job, in the concluding chapters of that book.

The teaching of nature in the book of Job.

Job is tortured and brought near to death by severe bodily disease. His friends have exhausted all their divinity and philosophy upon him, in the vain effort to convince him that he deserves this infliction for his special and aggravated sins. At length the Almighty intervenes and gives the final decision. But instead of discussing the ethical and theological difficulties of the case, He enters into a sublime and poetical description of nature. He speaks of the heaven above, of the atmosphere, its vapours and its storms, and of the habits and powers of animals. In short, Job is treated to a lecture on natural history. Yet this instantaneously effects what the arguments of the friends have altogether failed to induce, and Job humbles himself before God in contrition and repentance. His words are very remarkable (Job xlii. 1-12):

Job and his friends.

God's interference

> "I know that Thou canst do all things,
> From Thee no purpose is withheld;

Job's confession.

(Thou hast said) 'Who is this that obscures counsel without
knowledge?'[1]
(And I confess that) I have uttered what I understood not,
Things too hard for me which I know not,
But hear me now and I will speak.
(Thou hast said) 'I will demand of thee
And inform thou Me.'[2]
I have heard of Thee with the hearing of the ear,
And now mine eye seeth Thee;
Therefore do I abhor myself,
And repent in dust and ashes."

The effect of God's interference.

What does this import? Simply that, through the presentation to him of God's works, Job had attained a new view of God and of himself. He had not considered or fairly weighed the world around him in its grandeur, its complexity, its unaccountable relations, and contrasted it with his own little sphere of thought and work. Had he done so, he would, like Paul in later times, have said, "Hath not the potter power over the clay?" God, if really the architect of nature, must have thoughts and plans altogether beyond our comprehension. He must be absolute sovereign of all. It is our part to submit with patience to His dealing with us, to lean upon Him by faith, and thus to carry this almighty power with us. When brought to this state of mind, Job can be vindicated against his friends who have taken upon them to explain God's plans and have misrepresented them, as many good men like them are constantly doing; against Satan, the evil angel, who with all his intelligence and acuteness cannot comprehend Job's piety, but believes it to be mere self-interest, and who now sees himself foiled and Job brought into still greater prosperity; while by the result and the explanation of it handed down to our time, there is a permanent gain in favour of the solution of the great moral difficulties of humanity.

---

[1] Chap. xxxviii. 2.

[2] Chap. xxxviii. 3; xl. 7.

Three aspects of Job's case

I would put this case of Job before modern Christians in three aspects. (1) Do we attach enough of importance to the Gospel in nature, as vindicating God's sovereignty and fatherhood, and preaching submission, humility, and faith? Might we not here take a lesson from the Bible itself? (2) May there not be many in our own time who, like Job, have "heard of God with the hearing of the ear," but have not seen Him with the eye in His works? and, on the other hand, are there not many who have seen the works without seeing the Maker, who can even "magnify God's works which men behold," without knowing the Author of them? Would it not be well sometimes to bring together in friendly discussion those who thus look on only one side of the shield? (3) Should we not beware of the error of Job's friends in misrepresenting God's plans, and thereby misleading those whom we try to guide. These wise and well-meaning men had nature all around them, and had observed it with some care and minuteness, yet they disregarded its teachings, and dwelt on old saws and philosophic dogmas, till God Himself had to bring out the whirlwind and the thunder storm, the ostrich, the horse, and the hippopotamus to teach a better theology. The Book of Job belongs to a very ancient time, when men possessed little of divine revelation, perhaps none at all in a definite and dogmatic form, yet there are in our time many even of cultured minds as ignorant of God's ways as were Job's friends. To them the same elementary teaching may afford the training which they need.

The teaching given in the book of Job needed even by many cultured minds in our time.

The object of this Tract.

The scope of this Tract has necessarily been somewhat discursive, since its object has been to glance at a variety of things new and old, relating to the Works and the Word of God, and thus to encourage the study of the Bible as a storehouse of Divine wisdom for practical guidance, as a light shining in a dark world, and enabling us to see our relations to God and our fellow-men; above all, as the revelation of Jesus Christ, the great Enlightener and Healer, given of God that "whosoever believeth on Him may not perish, but have everlasting life!"

A SELECTION FROM

FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY'S

CATALOGUE

New Books for — — Thinking Minds.

WHAT ARE WE TO BELIEVE? or, The Testimony of Fulfilled Prophecy. By Rev. JOHN URQUHART. 16mo., 230 pages, cloth, 75 cents, net.

"This book, so small in bulk but so large in thought, sets forth a great mass of such testimony in lines so clear and powerful that we pity the man who could read it without amazement and awe. It is the very book to put into the hands of an intelligent Agnostic." —*The Christian*, London.

MANY INFALLIBLE PROOFS. By Rev. ARTHUR T. PIERSON, D. D. 317 pp. 12mo. Cloth, $1.00; paper, 35 cents, net.

"It is not an exercise in mental gymnastics, but an earnest inquiry after the truth."—*Daily Telegram*, Troy, N. Y.

"He does not believe that the primary end of the Bible is to teach science; but he argues with force and full conviction that nothing in the Bible has been shaken by scientific research."—*Independent*.

HOW I REACHED THE MASSES; Together with twenty-two lectures delivered in the Birmingham Town Hall on Sunday afternoons. By Rev. CHARLES LEACH, F. G. S. 16mo., cloth, $1.00.

There is much of very welcome good sense and practical illustration in these addresses. Pithy and pointed in admonishment, and wholesome in their didactic tone, they ought to exercise a good influence.

ENDLESS BEING; or, Man Made for Eternity. By Rev. J. L. BARLOW. Introduction by the Rev. P. S. HENSON, D. D. Cloth, 16mo., 165 pages, 75 cents.

An unanswerable work; meeting the so-called annihilation and kindred theories most satisfactorily. The author held for years these errors, and writes as one fully conversant with the ground he covers. It is a work which should be widely circulated,

PAPERS ON PREACHING. By the Right Rev. Bishop BALDWIN, Rev. Principal RAINY, D. D., Rev. J. R. VERNON, M. A., and others. Crown, 8vo, cloth, 75 cents.

"Preachers of all denominations will do well to read these practical and instructive disquisitions. The essay on "Expression in Preaching" is especially good.—*Christian*.

THE SABBATH; its Permanence, Promise, and Defence. By Rev. W. W. EVERTS, D. D. 12mo., 278 pages, cloth, $1.00.

No phase of the Sabbath question is left undiscussed, while every topic is treated in the briefest manner, and every touch of light shows the hand of a master.

"An incisive and effective discussion of the subject."—*N. Y. Observer*.

"A thoughtful Christian defence of that divine institution."—*Christian Advocate*.

QUESTIONS OF THE AGES. By Rev. MOSES SMITH. Cloth 12mo, 132 pages, 75 cents.

What is the Almighty?
What is man?
What is the Trinity?
Which is the Great Commandment.
Is there Common Sense in Religion?
What is Faith?
Is there a Larger Hope?
Is Life Worth Living?
What Mean these Stones?

"Discusses certain of the deep things of the Gospel in such a wise and suggestive fashion that they are helpful. One, answers negatively and conclusively the question, Is there a larger hope? '—*The Congregationalist*.

NEW YORK. :: Fleming H. Revell Company :: CHICAGO.

REFERENCE BOOKS
FOR
BIBLE STUDENTS.

JAMIESON, FAUSSET & BROWN'S Popular Portable Commentary. Critical, Practical, Explanatory. Four volumns in neat box, fine cloth, $8.00; half bound, $10.00.

A new edition, containing the complete unabridged notes in clear type on good paper, in four handsome 12 mo. volumes of about 1.000 pages each, with copious index, numerous illustrations and maps, and a Bible Dictionary compiled from Dr. Wm. Smith's standard work.

Bishop Vincent of Chautauqua fame says: "The *best* condensed commentary on the whole Bible is Jamieson, Fausset & Brown."

CRUDEN'S UNABRIDGED CONCORDANCE TO THE HOLY SCRIPTURES. With life of the author. 864 pp., 8vo., cloth (net), $1.00; half roan, sprinkled edges (net), 2.00; half roan, full gilt edges (net), $2.50.

SMITH'S BIBLE DICTIONARY, comprising its Antiquities, Biography, Geography and Natural History, with numerous maps and illustrations. Edited and condensed from his great work by WILLIAM SMITH, LL. D. 776 pages, 8vo, many illustrations, cloth, $1.50.

THE BIBLE TEXT CYCLOPEDIA. A complete classification of Scripture Texts in the form of an alphabetical list of subjects. By Rev. JAMES INGLIS. Large 8vo, 524 pages, cloth, $1.75.

The plan is much the same as the "Bible Text Book" with the valuable additional help in that the texts referred to are quoted in full. Thus the student is saved the time and labor of turning to numerous passages, which, when found, may not be pertinent to the subject he has in hand.

THE TREASURY OF SCRIPTURE KNOWLEDGE; consisting of 500,000 scripture references and parallel passages, with numerous notes. 8vo, 778 pages. cloth, $2.00.

A single examination of this remarkable compilation of references will convince the reader of the fact that "the Bible is its own best interpreter."

THE WORKS OF FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS, translated by WILLIAM WHISTON, A. M., with Life, Portrait, Notes and Index. A new cheap edition in clear type. Large 8vo, 684 pages, cloth, $2.00.

100.000 SYNONYMS AND ANTONYMS. By Rt. Rev. SAMUEL FALLOWS, A. M., D. D. 512 pages, cloth, $1.00.

A complete Dictionary of synonyms *and words of opposite* meanings, with an appendix of Briticisms, Americanisms, Colloquialisms, Homonims, Homophonous words, Foreign Phrases, etc., etc.

"This is one of the best books of its kind we have seen, and probably there is nothing published in the country that is equal to it."—*Y. M. C. A. Watchman.*

NEW YORK. :: Fleming H. Revell Company :: CHICAGO.

SUGGESTIVE BOOKS - -
- - FOR BIBLE READERS.

NEW NOTES FOR BIBLE READINGS. By the late S. R. BRIGGS, with brief Memoir of the author by Rev. JAS. H. BROOKES, D. D., Crown 8vo, cloth, $1.00 ; flexible, 75 cents.

"NEW NOTES" is not a reprint, and contains *Bible Readings* to be found in no other similar work, and, it is confidently believed, will be found more carefully prepared, and therefore more helpful and suggestive.

Everyone of the 60,000 readers of "Notes and Suggestions for Bible Readings" will welcome this entirely new collection containing selections from D. L. Moody, Major Whittle, J. H. Brookes, D. D., Prof. W. G. Moorehead, Rev. E. P. Marvin, Jno. Currie, Rev. W. J Erdman, Rev. F. E. Marsh, Dr. L. W. Munhall, etc.

NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS FOR BIBLE READINGS. By S. R. BRIGGS and J. H. ELLIOTT.

Containing, in addition to twelve introductory chapters on plans and method of Bible study and Bible readings, over six hundred outlines of Bible readings, by many of the most eminent Bible students of the day. Crown 8vo, 262 pp. Cloth, library style, $1.00; flexible cloth, .75; paper covers, .50.

THE OPEN SECRET; or, The Bible Explaining Itself. A series of intensely practical Bible readings. By HANNAH WHITALL SMITH. 320 pp. Fine cloth, $1.00.

That the author of this work has a faculty of presenting the "Secret Things" that are revealed in the Word of God is apparent to all who have read the exceedingly popular work, "The Christian's Secret of a Happy Life."

BIBLE BRIEFS; or, Outline Themes for Scripture Students. By G. C. & E. A. NEEDHAM. 16mo., 224 pages, cloth, $1.00.

The plan of these expositions is suggestive rather than exhaustive, and these suggestions are designed to aid Evangelists at home and missionaries abroad, Bible School Teachers, and Christian Association Secretaries and Workers.

BIBLE HELPS FOR BUSY MEN. By A. C. P. COOTE.

Contains over 200 Scripture subjects, clearly worked out and printed in good legible type, with an alphabetical index. 140 pages, 16mo.; paper, 30c.; cloth flex., 60c.

"Likely to be of use to overworked brethren."—C. H. SPURGEON.

"Given in a clear and remarkably telling form."—*Christian Leader.*

RUTH, THE MOABITESS; or Gleaning in the Book of Ruth. By HENRY MOORHOUSE. 16mo., paper covers, 20c.; cloth, 40c.

A characteristic series of Bible readings, full of suggestion and instruction.

BIBLE READINGS. By HENRY MOORHOUSE. 16mo., paper covers, 30 cents; cloth, 60 cents.

A series by one pre-eminently the man of one book, an incessant, intense, prayerful student of the Bible.

SYMBOLS AND SYSTEMS IN BIBLE READINGS. Rev. W. F. CRAFTS. 64 pages and cover, 25 cents.

Giving a plan of Bible reading, with fifty verses definitely assigned for each day, the Bible being arranged in the order of its events. The entire symbolism of the Bible explained concisely and clearly.

NEW YORK. :: Fleming H. Revell Company :: CHICAGO.

HAND BOOKS FOR BIBLE STUDENTS

THE LIFE OF CHRIST. Rev. JAS. STALKER, M. A. A new edition, with introduction by Rev. GEO. C. LORIMER, D. D. 12mo. cloth, 166 pages, 60 cents.

This work is in truth "*Multum in Parvo*," containing within small compass a vast amount of most helpful teaching, so admirably arranged that the reader gathers with remarkable definiteness the whole revealed record of the life work of our Lord in a nutshell of space and with a minimum of study.

THE LIFE OF ST. PAUL. By Rev. JAS. STALKER, M. A. 12mo. cloth, 184 pages, 60 cents.

As admirable a work as the exceedingly popular volume by this author on "The Life of Christ."

"An exceedingly compact life of the Apostle to the Gentiles. It is bristling with information, and is brief, yet clear. As an outline of Paul's life it cannot be surpassed."—*N. Y. Christian Inquirer.*

THE BIBLE STUDENTS' HANDBOOK. 12mo cloth, 288 pages, 50 cents.

One of those helpful works, worth its price, multiplied by several scores. It contains an introduction to the study of the Scriptures, with a brief account of the books of the Bible, their writers, etc., also a synopsis of the life and work of our Lord, and complete history of the manners and customs of the times, etc.

THE TOPICAL TEXT BOOK. 16mo. cloth, 292 pages, 60 cents.

A remarkably complete and helpful Scripture text book for the topical study of the Bible. Useful in preparing Bible readings, addresses, etc.

THE BIBLE REMEMBRANCER. 24mo. cloth, 198 pages, 50 cts.

A complete analyses of the Bible is here given, in small compass, in addition to a large amount of valuable Biblical information, and twelve colored maps.

BIBLE LESSONS ON JOSHUA AND JUDGES. By Rev. J. GURNEY HOARE, M. A. 16mo cloth, 124 pages, 50 cents.

FIFTY-TWO LESSONS ON (1) The Works of Our Lord; (2) Claims of Our Lord. Forming a year's course of instruction for Bible classes, Sunday schools and lectures. By FLAVEL S. COOK, M. A., D. D. 16mo. cloth, 104 pages, 50 cents.

FIFTY-TWO LESSONS ON (1) The Names and Titles of Our Lord; (2) Prophesies Concerning Our Lord and their Fulfillment. By FLAVEL S. COOK, M. A., D. D. 16mo. cloth, 104 pages, 50 cents.

Extremely full in the matter of reference and explanation, and likely to make the user "search the Scriptures."

OUTLINE OF THE BOOKS OF THE BIBLE. By Rev. J. H. BROOKES, D. D. Invaluable to the young student of the Bible as a "First Lesson" in the study of the Book. 180 pages. Cloth, 50 cents, paper covers, 25 cents.

CHRIST AND THE SCRIPTURES. By Rev. ADOLPH SAPHER. 16mo. cloth, 160 pages, 75 cents.

To all disciples of Christ this work commends itself at once by its grasp of truth, its insight, the life in it, and its spiritual force.—*Christian Work.*

NEW YORK. :: Fleming H. Revell Company :: CHICAGO.

WORKS OF D. L. MOODY.

By the strenuous cultivation of his gift Mr. Moody has attained to a clear and incisive style which preachers ought to study; and he has the merit, which many more cultivated men lack, of saying nothing that does not tend to the enforcement of the particular truth he is enunciating. He knows how to disencumber his text of all extraneous matter, and exhibits his wisdom as a preacher hardly less by what he leaves out than by what he includes. Apart from its primary purpose each of these books has a distinct value as a lesson on homiletics to ministers and students.—*The Christian Leader.*

Bible Characters.

Prevailing Prayer; What Hinders It. Thirtieth Thousand

To the Work! To the Work! A Trumpet Call. Thirtieth Thousand.

The Way to God and How to Find It. One Hundred and Fifth Thousand.

Heaven; its Hope; its Inhabitants; its Happiness; its Riches; its Reward. One Hundred and Twenty-Fifth Thousand.

Secret Power; or the Secret of Success in Christian Life and Work. Seventy-Second Thousand.

Twelve Select Sermons. One Hundred and Sixty-Fifth Thousand.

The above are bound in uniform style and price. Paper covers 30 *cents: cloth*, 60 *cents. Also issued in cloth, beveled edge, and put up in neat box containing the seven volumes. Price of set*, $4 20.

Daniel, the Prophet. Tenth Thousand. Paper cover, 20c. cloth, 40c.

The Full Assurance of Faith. Seventh Thousand. Some thoughts on Christian confidence. Paper cover, 15c,; cloth, 25c.

The Way and the Word. Sixty-Fifth Thousand. Comprising "Regeneration," and "How to Study the Bible." Cloth, 25c.; paper, 15c.

How to Study the Bible. Forty-Fifth Thousand. Cloth, 15c. paper, 10c.

The Second Coming of Christ. Forty-Fifth Thousand. Paper, 10c.

Inquiry Meetings. By Mr. Moody and Maj. Whittle. Paper, 15c.

Gospel Booklets. By D. L. Moody. 12 separate sermons.

Published in small square form, suitable for distribution, or inclosing in letters. 35 cents per dozen, $2.50 per hundred. May be had assorted or of any separate tract.

Any of the above sent postpaid to any address on receipt of price. Special rates for distribution made known on application.

NEW YORK. :: Fleming H. Revell Company :: CHICAGO.

· MISSIONARY PUBLICATIONS ·

REPORT OF THE CENTENARY CONFERENCE on the Protestant Missions of the World. Held in London, June, 1888. Edited by the Rev. JAMES JOHNSTON, F. S. S., Secretary of the Conference. Two large 8vo. vols., 1200 pages, $2.00 net per set.

An important feature in this report, lack of which has prejudiced many against reports in general, is the special care taken by the Editor, who has succeeded in making the work an interesting and accurate reproduction of the most important accumulation of facts from the Mission Fields of the World, as given by the representatives of all the Evangelical Societies of Christendom.

And another: The exceptionally complete and helpful indexing of the entire work in such a thorough manner as to make it of the greatest value as a Reference Encyclopedia on mission topics for years to come.

THE MISSIONARY YEAR BOOK FOR 1889-90. Containing Historical and Statistical accounts of the Principle Protestant Missionary Societies in America, Great Britain and the Continent of Europe.

The American edition, edited by Rev. J. T. GRACEY, D.D., of Buffalo, embraces about 450 pages, one-fourth being devoted to the work of American Societies, and will contain Maps of India, China Japan, Burmah, and Siam; also a language Map of India and comparative diagrams illustrating areas, population and progress of Mission work. This compilation will be the best presentation of the work of the American Societies in Pagan Lands that has yet been given to the public. The book is strongly recommended by Rev. JAS. JOHNSTON, F.S.S., as a companion volume to the Report of the Century Conference on Missions. Cloth, 12mo. $1.25.

GARENGANZE: or, Seven Years' Pioneer Missionary Work in Central Africa. By FRED. S. ARNOT, with introduction by Rev. A. T. PIERSON, D.D. Twenty Illustrations and an original Map.

The author's two trips across Africa, entirely unarmed and unattended except by the local and constantly changing carriers, and in such marked contrast with many modern adventurers, strongly impress one to ask if another Livingstone has not appeared among us. Traversing where no white man had ever been seen before, and meeting kings and chiefs accustomed only to absolute power, he demanded and received attention in the name of his God. Cloth 8vo, 290 pages, $1.25.

IN THE FAR EAST: China Illustrated. Letters from Geraldine Guinness. Edited by her sister, with Introduction by Rev. J. HUDSON TAYLOR. A characteristic Chinese cover. Cloth 4to, 224 pages, $1.50; boards, $1.00.

CONTENTS.

"Good-Bye!"
Second Class.
On the Way to China.
Hong-Kong and Shanghai.
First days in the Flowery Land
Opium Suicides amongst Women.
Ten Days on a Chinese Canal.
At Home in our Chinese "Haddon Hall."
By Wheelbarrow to Antong.
Life on a Chinese Farm.
A Visit to the "Shun" City.
Blessing—and Need of Blessing—In the Far East.

Rev. C. H. SPURGEON, writes:

"I have greatly enjoyed 'In the Far East.' God blessing it, the book should send armies of believers to invade the Flowry Land."

The author is to be congratulated fo. the taste and beauty with which these letters are now put into permanent form. A full page colored map of China enhances this admirable gift book.

NEW YORK. :: Fleming H. Revell Company :: CHICAGO

Missionary Publications

(*Continued.*)

A CENTURY OF CHRISTIAN PROGRESS, and its Lesson. By the Rev. JAMES JOHNSTON, F.S.S., editor of "Report of the Missionary Conference." Cloth, 50 cents; paper, 25 cents.

Dr. A. T. Pierson, in December number of "Missionary Review," mentions this as being one of the five most valuable books on the history of Mission work.

Pastor Spurgeon says: "It is no common-place generalization, but real fact; and much of that fact was known to few of us. Buy the book."

FOREIGN MISSIONS OF PROTESTANT CHURCHES. Their State and their Prospects. By Dr. J. MURRAY MITCHELL, M. A. 16mo, cloth, 50 cents.

This timely little work presents a wide general view of the field of Missions. Having shown what Missions have done, the author sets forth the state of the chief Pagan religions, the different modes of missionary action, and then, in an eminently practical way, discusses the actual situation, both as to the needs of the heathen and the mind and attitude of the Christian public.

THE EVANGELIZATION OF THE WORLD. By B. BROMHALL, Secretary of the China Inland Mission. Large quarto, 242 pages, 10 portraits and three maps. Bound in boards, net, $1.00. Bound in cloth, with handsome dies, net, $1.50. By mail, postage extra, 18 cts.

"This is a most remarkable book. . . It is one of the most powerful appeals for Foreign Missions issued in our time, and altogether perhaps the best hand-book that exists for preachers and speakers in their behalf."—*The Church Missionary Intelligencer*.

OUTLINE MISSIONARY SERIES.

By Rev. J. T. GRACEY, D.D., editor of the American edition of "The Missionary Year Book."

INDIA. 212 pages, paper 50 cents; cloth $1.00.

This volume contains an excellent colored Map of India, showing railroads and prominent mission stations; also a map of Burmah and mission stations; also a Map showing the distribution of Languages of India; also *diagrams* illustrating *populations* and *areas* as compared with other countries.

CHINA. 64 pages, price 15 cents.

Rev. R. G. Wilder, says:—"Your 'China' is a gem. It must do great good."

Rev. D. W. C. Huntington, D.D., says:—"I began to mark passages, but soon found that I should have to mark the whole book. It is all cream. The information is worth ten times its cost.

Miss Isabella Hart, of Baltimore, says:—"I could hardly have believed that so much could have been put, and put so expressively and strongly in so small a space. I can not express my appreciation of it."

"In its general account of Chinese life and history, it condenses the substance of hundreds of pages into a few graphic and eloquent paragraphs."—*The Gospel in all Lands*, New York.

OPEN DOORS. 64 pages, price 15 cents.

Those who are interested in missionary topics, as all ought to be, will find this little pamphlet affords a great deal of valuable information as to Christian opportunity in Africa, Japan, Burmah, Mexico, South America, Korea, and the islands of the sea. Dr. Gracey is himself a former missionary, and is an authority upon the subjects upon which he writes. We strongly commend it to all. It shows with a clearness, almost startling, the present opportunities for Christian work.

NEW YORK. :: Fleming H. Revell Company :: CHICAGO

Popular Missionary Biographies.

12mo, 160 pages. Fully illustrated; cloth extra, 75 cents each.

Rev. C. H. Spurgeon, writes: "Crowded with facts that both interest and inspire, we can conceive of no better plan to spread the Missionary spirit than the multiplying of such biographies; and we would specially commend this series to those who have the management of libraries and selection of prizes in our Sunday Schools."

From *The Missionary Herald*: "We commended this series in our last issue, and a further examination leads us to renew our commendation, and to *urge* the placing of this series of missionary books in all our Sabbath-school libraries.

These books are handsomely printed and bound and are beautifully illustrated, and we are confident that they will prove attractive to all young people."

SAMUEL CROWTHER, the Slave Boy who became Bishop of the Niger. By Jesse Page, author of "Bishop Patterson."

THOMAS J. COMBER, Missionary Pioneer to the Congo. By Rev. J. B. Myers, Association Secretary Baptist Missionary Society.

BISHOP PATTESON, the Martyr of Melanesia. By Jesse Page.

GRIFFITH JOHN, Founder of the Hankow Mission, Central China. By Wm. Robson, of the London Missionary Society.

ROBERT MORRISON, the Pioneer of Chinese Missions. By Wm. J. Townsend, Sec. Methodist New Connexion Missionary Soc'y.

ROBERT MOFFAT, the Missionary Hero of Kuruman. By David J. Deane, author of "Martin Luther, the Reformer," etc.

WILLIAM CAREY, the Shoemaker who became a Missionary. By Rev. J. B. Myers, Association Secretary Baptist Missionary Society.

JAMES CHALMERS, Missionary and Explorer of Rarotonga and New Guinea. By Wm. Robson, of the London Missionary Soc'y.

MISSIONARY LADIES IN FOREIGN LANDS. By Mrs. E. R. Pilman, author of "Heroines of the Mission Fields," etc.

JAMES CALVERT; or, From Dark to Dawn in Fiji.

JOHN WILLIAMS, the Martyr of Erromanga. By Rev. James J. Ellis.

HENRY MARTYN, his Life and Labors. Cambridge-India Persia. By Jesse Page.

UNIFORM WITH THE ABOVE.

HENRY M. STANLEY, the African Explorer. By Arthur Montefiore, F.R.G.S. Brought down to 1889.

DAVID LIVINGSTON, His Labors and His Legacy. By Arthur Montefiore, F.R.G.S.

JOHN WICLIFFE and MARTIN LUTHER. By D. J. Deane.

NEW YORK. :: Fleming H. Revell Company :: CHICAGO

By-Paths of Bible Knowledge

"The volumes issuing under the above general title fully deserve success. They have been entrusted to scholars who have a special acquaintance with the subjects about which they severally treat."—*Athenæum.*

These books are written by specialists, and their aim is to give the results of the latest and best scholarships on questions of Biblical history, science and archæology. The volumes contain much information that is not easily accessible, even to those who have a large acquaintance with the higher literature on these subjects.

15. **Early Bible Songs.**
With introduction on the Nature and Spirit of Hebrew Song, by A. H. Drysdale M. A... $1 00

14. **Modern Discoveries on the Site of Ancient Ephesus.**
By J. T. Wood, F. S. A. Illustrated... $1 00

13. **The Times of Isaiah.**
As illustrated from Contemporary Monuments. By A. H. Sayce, LL. D. .80

12. **The Hittites; or the Story of a Forgotten Empire.**
By A. H. Sayce, LL. D. Illustrated. Crown, 8vo... $1 20

11. **Animals of the Bible.**
By H. Chichester Hart, Naturalist to Sir G. Nares' Arctic Expedition and Professor Hull's Palestine Expedition. Illustrated, Crown, 8vo $1 20

10. **The Trees and Plants Mentioned in the Bible.**
By W. H. Groser, B. Sc. Illustrated... $1 00

9. **The Diseases of the Bible.**
By Sir J. Risdon Bennett... $1 00

8. **The Dwellers on the Nile.**
Chapters on the Life, Literature, History and Customs of Ancient Egypt. By E. A. Wallis Budge, M. A., Assistant in Department of Oriental Antiquities, British Museum. Illustrated... $1 20

7. **Assyria; Its Princes, Priests and People.**
By A. H. Sayce, M. A., LL. D., author of "Fresh Light from Ancient Monuments," "Introduction to Ezra, Nehemiah and Esther," etc. Illustrated... $1 20

6. **Egypt and Syria.**
Their Physical Features in Relation to Bible History. By Sir J. W. Dawson, Principal of McGill College, Montreal, F. G. S., F. R. S., author of "The Chain of Life in Geological Time," etc. Second edition, revised and enlarged. With many illustrations... $1 20

5. **Galilee in the time of Christ.**
By Selah Merrill, D. D., author of "East of the Jordan," etc. With Map $1 00

4. **Babylonian Life and History.**
By E. A. Willis Budge, M. A., Cambridge, Assistant in the Department of Oriental Antiquities, British Museum, illustrated... $1 20

3. **Recent Discoveries on the Temple Hill at Jerusalem.**
By the Rev. J. King, M. A., Authorized Lecturer for the Palestine Exploration Fund. With Maps, Plans and Illustrations... $1 00

2. **Fresh Lights From the Ancient Monuments.**
A Sketch of the most striking Confirmations of the Bible from recent discoveries in Egypt, Assyria, Babylonia, Palestine and Asia Minor. By A. H. Sayce, LL. D., Deputy Professor of Comparative Philology, Oxford, etc. With fac-similes from photographs... $1 20

1. **Cleopatra's Needle.**
History of the London Obelisk, with an Exposition of the Hieroglyphics. By the Rev. J. King, Lecturer for the Palestine Exploration Fund. With Illustrations... $1 00

NEW YORK. :: Fleming H. Revell Company :: CHICAGO.

Important Missionary Publications.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF JOHN G. PATON. Missionary to the New Hebrides. Introductory note by Arthur T. Pierson, D.D. 2 vols., 12mo., portrait and map, in neat box, $3.00.

One of the most remarkable biographies of modern times.

"I have just laid down the most robust and the most fascinating piece of autobiography that I have met with in many a day. . . . . It is the story of the wonderful work wrought by John G. Paton, the famous missionary to the New Hebrides; he was made of the same stuff with Livingstone."—T. L. CUYLER.

"It stands with such books as those Dr. Livingstone gave the world, and shows to men that the heroes of the cross are not merely to be sought in past ages."—*Christian Intelligencer.*

THE LIFE OF JOHN KENNETH MACKENZIE. Medical Missionary to China; with the story of the First Chinese Hospital by Mrs. Bryson, author of "Child Life in Chinese Homes," etc. 12mo., cloth, 400 pages, price $1.50 with portrait in photogravure.

"The story of a singularly beautiful life, sympathetically and ably written. . . . . A really helpful, elevating book."—*London Missionary Chronicle.*

"The volume records much that is fresh and interesting bearing on Chinese customs and manners as seen and vividly described by a missionary who had ample opportunities of studying them under most varied circumstances and conditions."—*Scotsman.*

THE GREATEST WORK IN THE WORLD. The Evangelization of all Peoples in the Present Century. By Rev. Arthur T. Pierson, D.D. 12mo., leatherette, gilt top, 35c.

The subject itself is an inspiration, but this latest production of Dr. Pierson thrills with the life which the Master Himself has imparted to it. It will be a welcome addition to Missionary literature.

THE CRISIS OF MISSIONS. By Rev. Arthur T. Pierson, D.D. Cloth, $1.25; paper, 35c.

"We do not hesitate to say that this book is the most purposeful, earnest and intelligent review of the mission work and field which has ever been given to the Church."—*Christian Statesman.*

MEDICAL MISSIONS. Their Place and Power. By John Lowe, F. R. C. S. E., Secretary of the Edinburgh Medical Mission Society. 12mo., 308 pages, cloth, $1.50.

"This book contains an exhaustive account of the benefits that may, and in point of fact do, accrue from the use of the medical art as a Christian agency. Mr. Lowe is eminently qualified to instruct us in this matter, having himself been so long engaged in the same field."—*From Introduction by Sir William Muir.*

ONCE HINDU: NOW CHRISTIAN. The early life of Baba Padmanji. Translated from the Marathi. Edited by J. Murray Mitchell, M. A., LLD. 12mo., 155 pages, with appendix. Cloth, 75c.

"A more instructive or more interesting narrative of a human soul, once held firmly in the grip of oriental superstition, idolatry and caste, gradually emerging into the light, liberty and peace of a regenerate child of God, does not often come to hand."—*Missionary Herald.*

AN INTENSE LIFE. By George F. Herrick. A sketch of the life and work of Rev. Andrew T Pratt, M.D., Missionary of the A. B. C. F. M., in Turkey, 1852–1872. 16mo., cloth, 50c.

NEW YORK. : : Fleming H. Revell Company : : CHICAGO.

Important Missionary Publications

(*Continued.*)

EVERY-DAY LIFE IN SOUTH INDIA, or, the Story of Coopooswamey. An Autobiography. With fine engravings by E. Whymper. 12mo., cloth, $1.00.

THE CHILDREN OF INDIA. Written for children by one of their friends. Illustrations and map. Small 4to., cloth, $1.25.

"These are good books for the Sunday-School Library, and will help young people in missionary societies who desire to have an intelligent idea of the people in India whom they are sending their money and their missionaries to convert."—*Missionary Herald.*

HINDUISM, PAST AND PRESENT. With an account of recent Hindu reformers, and a brief comparison between Hinduism and Christianity. By J. Murray Mitchell, M.A., LLD. 12mo., cloth, $1.60.

"A praiseworthy attempt to present a popular view of a vast and important subject."—*Saturday Review.*

GOSPEL ETHNOLOGY. With illustrations. By S. R. Paterson, F. G. S. 12mo, cloth., $1.00.

"The first attempt to treat this subject from a thorough-going scientific standpoint. A very powerful argument for the truth of Christianity."—*English Churchman.*

"A book to refer to for information not easily to be obtained otherwise.—*Church Missionary Intelligencer.*

NATIVE LIFE IN SOUTH INDIA. Being sketches of the social and religious characteristics of the Hindus. By the Rev. Henry Rice. With many illustrations from native sketches. 12mo., cloth boards, $1.00.

"Those who have heard Mr. Rice's missionary addresses will be prepared to hear that this is a fascinating book."—*Life and Work.*

CHRISTIAN PROGRESS IN CHINA. Gleanings from the writings and speaches of many workers. By Arnold Foster, B.A., London Missionary, Hankow. With map of China. 12mo., cloth, $1.00.

AMONG THE MONGOLS. By Rev. James Gilmour, M.A., London Mission, Peking. Numerous engravings from photographs and native sketches. 12mo., gilt edges, cloth, $1.00.

"The newness and value of the book consists solely in its Defoe quality, that when you have read it you know, and will never forget, all Mr. Gilmour knows and tells of how Mongols live."—*Spectator.*

EVERY-DAY LIFE IN CHINA. or, Scenes along River and Road in the Celestial Empire. By Edwin J. Dukes. Illustrations from the author's sketches. 12mo., with embellished cover, $2.00.

That China is a mysterious problem to all who interest themselves in its affairs is the only excuse for offering another book on the subject.

NEW YORK. : : Fleming H. Revell Company : : CHICAGO.

The "Northfield Books."

COLLEGE STUDENTS AT NORTHFIELD; or, A College of Colleges, No. 2. Conducted during July, 1888: Containing addresses by Mr. D. L. Moody, Rev. J. Hudson Taylor, M. D., Bishop Hendrix, Rev. Alex. McKenzie, D.D., Rev. Henry Clay Trumbull, D. D., Prof. W. B. Harper, and others.

The "Practical Talks" as given in report of last year's gathering, the demand for which has called for a seventh edition, has induced us to publish an account of this year's proceedings, none the less "practical," and we feel sure will be as fully appreciated.

12mo, 296 Pages, Cloth, $1.00 net.

Dr. A. T. Pierson writes: "Admirable book. I deem it one of the best of all the practical helps issued by the press."

Dr. Joseph Cook.—"It is well edited, well printed, and well inspired from on High. Is full of a Holy Fire of spiritual zeal, which I hope to see spread far and wide."

President M. E. Gates, of Rutgers College, writes: "The influence which has gone out on the College Life of this country, from the summer meetings at Northfield, is so potent for good, that I welcome the extension and perpetuation of that influence through this book."

SEVENTH THOUSAND.

A COLLEGE OF COLLEGES; or, Practical Talks to College Students. Given in July, 1887, by Prof. Henry Drummond, F.R.S.S., Rev. J. A. Broadus, D.D., Prof. Townsend, Rev. A. T. Pierson, D.D., Mr. D. L. Moody, and others.

12mo, 288 Pages, Cloth, $1.00 net.

"Of signal value."—*Chautauqua Herald.*

"We commend this volume very cordially."—*Presbyterian Witness.*

"The volume closes with a chapter of 'nuggets' from Northfield, which is no exception, however, as the other chapters are equally rich in 'nuggets.'"—*The Independent.*

D. L. MOODY AT HOME. His Home and Home Work. Embracing a description of the educational institutions established at Northfield, Mass., together with an account of the various noted gatherings of Christian workers at the place, and the most helpful and suggestive lectures, and the best thoughts there exchanged; adding, also, many helpful and practical hints.

12mo, 288 Pages, Cloth, Eight Illustrations, $1.00.

The New York *Independent* says: "There is nothing in the career of this remarkable man more striking than his work at Northfield."

The New York *Evangelist* spoke most truly when it said: "The public is unaware of Mr. Moody's enormous investments at Northfield, that will pay him abundant interest long after he reaches heaven."

NEW YORK. :: Fleming H. Revell Company :: CHICAGO

Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries
1 1012 01197 1704